

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 25-1796

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Marcellus Corey-Parham

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Missouri - St. Louis

Submitted: November 20, 2025

Filed: November 25, 2025

[Unpublished]

Before LOKEN, KELLY, and ERICKSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Marcellus Corey-Parham appeals the within-Guidelines-range sentence imposed by the district court¹ after he pleaded guilty to a firearm offense. His counsel

¹The Honorable Sarah E. Pitlyk, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

has moved for leave to withdraw, and has filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), challenging the substantive reasonableness of the sentence.

Upon careful review, we conclude that the district court did not impose a substantively unreasonable sentence. See United States v. Feemster, 572 F.3d 455, 461-62 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (reviewing sentence under deferential abuse-of-discretion standard; discussing substantive reasonableness); United States v. Callaway, 762 F.3d 754, 760 (8th Cir. 2014) (on appeal, within-Guidelines-range sentence may be presumed reasonable); United States v. Farmer, 647 F.3d 1175, 1179 (8th Cir. 2011) (simply because district court weighed relevant factors more heavily than defendant preferred does not mean it abused discretion); United States v. Anderson, 90 F.4th 1226, 1227 (8th Cir. 2024) (district court has wide latitude to weigh 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors and to assign some factors greater weight than others, including discretion to assign more weight to offense’s nature and circumstances than to defendant’s mitigating personal characteristics).

We have also independently reviewed the record under Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), and we find no non-frivolous issues for appeal. Accordingly, we grant counsel leave to withdraw, and we affirm.
