

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 27 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 20-30253

Plaintiff-Appellee,

D.C. No. 3:17-cr-00052-SLG-1

v.

RICKY A. BLODGETT,

MEMORANDUM*

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Alaska

Sharon L. Gleason, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 19, 2021**

Before: SCHROEDER, SILVERMAN, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Ricky A. Blodgett appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

Blodgett argues that the district court incorrectly determined that his

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

hepatitis C was not an “extraordinary and compelling reason[]” to grant compassionate release. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i). He further argues that the Bureau of Prisons is not meeting his medical needs, and that the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors support his release. The district court considered these arguments, but concluded that the lack of support in the record for Blodgett’s assertions concerning his medical condition, the seriousness of his offense, his significant criminal history, and his disciplinary infractions while incarcerated counseled against release. Given the record before the district court, it did not abuse its discretion by denying Blodgett’s motion. *See United States v. Aruda*, 993 F.3d 797, 799 (9th Cir. 2021) (stating standard of review); *United States v. Robertson*, 895 F.3d 1206, 1213 (9th Cir. 2018) (a district court abuses its discretion only if its decision is illogical, implausible, or without support in the record).

AFFIRMED.