UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6173

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MARK KERRY CRENSHAW,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Mark S. Davis, District Judge. (2:90-cr-00117-MSD-1)

Submitted: October 7, 2026 Decided: November 6, 2026

Before NIEMEYER, GREGORY, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mark Kerry Crenshaw, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mark Kerry Crenshaw appeals the district court's order granting in part his motion for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A), as amended by the First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-391, § 603(b)(1), 132 Stat. 5194, 5239. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

We review the district court's ruling on a compassionate release motion for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Holley*, 179 F.4th 985, 989 (4th Cir. 2026). "A district court analyzes a compassionate release motion in two steps. First, it determines whether the defendant is eligible for a sentence reduction." *United States v. Moody*, 115 F.4th 304, 310 (4th Cir. 2024). "A defendant is eligible if the court finds 'extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant such a reduction,'" *United States v. Bond*, 56 F.4th 381, 383 (4th Cir. 2023) (quoting 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i)), and that relief is "consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission," *Moody*, 115 F.4th at 310 (internal quotation marks omitted). At step two, "the court considers whether the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors support relief." *Id.*

Upon review of Crenshaw's appellate submissions[*] and the record on appeal, we find no reversible error in the district court's decision not to grant a larger reduction in Crenshaw's sentence. *See Rutherford v. United States*, 146 S. Ct. 1320, 1330-31, 1335 (2026); *see also Greenlaw v. United States*, 554 U.S. 237, 244 (2008) ("[A]n appellate

[*] Crenshaw moves to supplement the issues in his case. We grant the motion and have considered those additional issues in reviewing Crenshaw's appeal.

court may not alter a judgment to benefit a nonappealing party."). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *United States v. Crenshaw*, No. 2:90-cr-00117-MSD-1 (E.D. Va. Feb. 26, 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