

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6935

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

PIERRE RASHAD PRESTON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Danville. Elizabeth K. Dillon, Chief District Judge. (4:21-cr-00015-EKD-1)

Submitted: March 26, 2026

Decided: March 31, 2026

Before RICHARDSON and BERNER, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Pierre Rashad Preston, Appellant Pro Se. S. Cagle Juhan, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlottesville, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Pierre Rashad Preston appeals the district court's order denying his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) motions for compassionate release and motions for emergency hearings and relief, confining his appeal to the denial of his motions for compassionate release.* We review a district court's denial of a motion for compassionate release for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Brown*, 78 F.4th 122, 127 (4th Cir. 2023). "In doing so, we ensure that the district court has not acted arbitrarily or irrationally, has followed the statutory requirements, and has conducted the necessary analysis for exercising its discretion." *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). "To grant a compassionate release motion, the district court must conclude that the prisoner is eligible for a sentence reduction because he has shown extraordinary and compelling reasons supporting relief, and that release is appropriate under the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors, to the extent those factors are applicable." *Id.* at 128 (citation modified).

We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Preston's motions. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *United States v. Preston*, No. 4:21-cr-00015-EKD-1 (W.D. Va. Oct. 24, 2025). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

* Preston has also filed motions to place this appeal in abeyance and to appoint or assign counsel. We deny those motions.