UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6889

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM GRAHAM, a/k/a Billy Graham,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Big Stone Gap. James P. Jones, Senior District Judge. (2:01-cr-10010-JPJ-2)

Submitted: October 21, 2026 Decided: November 4, 2026

Before KING, HARRIS, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William J. Graham, Appellant Pro Se. Whitney Demain Pierce, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Abingdon, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Graham appeals the district court's order denying his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) motion for compassionate release, which Graham primarily predicated on the caretaking needs of his ailing mother. *See* U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.13(b)(3)(C), p.s. (2025) (establishing "[t]he incapacitation of the defendant's parent when the defendant would be the only available caregiver for the parent" as an extraordinary and compelling reason for release). Unfortunately, Graham's mother passed away during the pendency of this appeal. Accordingly, we find that this part of the appeal is now moot. *See Fleet Feet, Inc. v. NIKE, Inc.*, 986 F.3d 458, 463 (4th Cir. 2021) ("If an event occurs during the pendency of an appeal that makes it impossible for a court to grant effective relief to a prevailing party, then the appeal must be dismissed as moot." (citation modified)).

Graham also contended that his rehabilitation while incarcerated warranted relief. But as the district court correctly observed, "[r]ehabilitation of the defendant alone shall not be considered an extraordinary and compelling reason" for compassionate release. 28 U.S.C. § 994(t). Accordingly, we dismiss the part of the appeal pertaining to Graham's mother, and we affirm the rest of the district court's order. We deny as moot Graham's motions for emergency relief. 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.

DISMISSED IN PART,
AFFIRMED IN PART