

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 1 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LARISA SAKHANSKIY,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 23-2092

D.C. No. 2:13-cr-00160-TLN-AC-2

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Troy L. Nunley, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 22, 2024\*\*

Before: CALLAHAN, LEE, and FORREST, Circuit Judges.

Larisa Sakhanskiy appeals pro se from the district court's order denying her motion for a sentence reduction under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. Reviewing for abuse of discretion, *see United States v. Aruda*, 993 F.3d 797, 799 (9th Cir. 2021), 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)*.

Sakhanskiy sought compassionate release on the basis of her serious medical conditions, the COVID-19 pandemic, the alleged lack of adequate medical care at her facility, and her rehabilitation and minimum-security status. The district court concluded that (1) Sakhanskiy’s medical conditions did not amount to extraordinary and compelling circumstances because the conditions did not “substantially diminish [Sakhanskiy’s] ability to provide self-care and the BOP is capable of adequately treating those conditions,” and (2) relief was unwarranted in light of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, including Sakhanskiy’s statutory minimum sentence and the serious nature of her offenses, which resulted in over \$500,000 in loss and placed first responders in danger. We find no abuse of discretion in the court’s conclusions, which are supported by the record. *See 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).

We decline to consider Sakhanskiy’s remaining arguments for a sentence reduction, which she raises for the first time on appeal. *See Padgett v. Wright*, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

All pending motions are denied.

**AFFIRMED.**