

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JAN 21 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 20-50327

Plaintiff-Appellee,

D.C. No. 2:05-cr-01040-JFW-1

v.

JONATHAN JEROME HILLS, AKA
Jerome Johnathan Hill, AKA Jerome
Johnson Hill, AKA Janathan J. Hills, AKA
Jerome Hills, AKA Jerome J. Hills, AKA
Jerome Johnathan Hills, AKA Jerome
Jonathan Hills, AKA Jerome Jonthan Hills,
AKA Johanathon Jerome Hills, AKA
Johnatham J. Hills, AKA Johnathan Jerome
Hills, AKA Johnathon Jerome Hills, AKA
Jonatham Jerome Hills, AKA Jonathan Hills,
AKA Jonathon Jerome Hills, AKA Jonthan
Jerome Hills, AKA Romeo Hills, AKA
Robert Ricks, AKA Rome, AKA Romeo,

MEMORANDUM*

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
John F. Walter, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 19, 2022**

* 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).

Before: SILVERMAN, CLIFTON, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Jonathan Jerome Hills appeals 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.

Hills contends that the district court erred by relying on its evaluation of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors from the original sentencing hearing. We disagree. Though the court referenced its § 3553(a) analysis from that earlier hearing, the record reflects that the court considered and applied the factors anew to reasonably conclude that release was unwarranted in light of Hills's significant criminal history and the Bureau of Prisons's ability to manage Hills's health conditions. Moreover, contrary to Hills's contentions, the record reflects that the district court considered Hills's arguments, including those regarding post-sentencing rehabilitation, and adequately explained its decision to deny his motion. *See Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 1959, 1965 (2018). The court did not abuse its discretion. *See United States v. Aruda*, 993 F.3d 797, 799 (9th Cir. 2021).

Appellee's motion to supplement the record is denied.

AFFIRMED.