

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 18 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

PETER CHRISTOPHER,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 23-650

D.C. No. 1:18-cr-00059-DKW-RT-1

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Hawaii
Derrick K. Watson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 12, 2023**

Before: WALLACE, LEE, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

Peter Christopher appeals pro se from the district court's denial of his motion for early termination of his supervised release. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for abuse of discretion, *see United States v. Emmett*, 749 F.3d 817, 819 (9th Cir. 2014), and we affirm.

* 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).

Christopher contends that early termination of his supervised release is warranted because he has performed well on supervision and has successfully transitioned back into the community. He contends that the district court applied the wrong legal standard, ignored relevant facts, and failed to explain adequately its decision. The record does not support these claims. The court's order makes clear that it fully considered Christopher's circumstances and denied early termination in light of the "interests of justice" and "nature and circumstances of the offense," which are permissible considerations. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e); *Emmett*, 749 F.3d at 819. Contrary to Christopher's argument, the court did not deny early termination to punish him; rather, its reference to punishment was in connection with its discussion of the original sentence. Moreover, the court adequately explained its decision to deny Christopher's motion. *See Emmett*, 749 F.3d at 820-21. On this record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its "broad discretion" by denying Christopher's request for early termination. *See id.* at 819.

AFFIRMED.