

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 24 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ERIC JAMAR GOODALL,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 23-3439

D.C. No.

2:15-cr-00077-JCM-VCF-1

MEMORANDUM\*

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

James C. Mahan, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 22, 2024\*\*

Phoenix, Arizona

Before: M. SMITH, BADE, and FORREST, Circuit Judges.

Defendant-Appellant Eric Jamar Goodall appeals the denial of his motion for compassionate release. He contends the district court abused its discretion because (1) the underlying offense and Goodall's medical symptoms constituted

---

\* 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).

“extraordinary and compelling reasons” for compassionate release; and (2) the court failed to consider supplemental information regarding Goodall’s medical symptoms. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

In deciding whether to grant a defendant’s motion for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i), we “consider (1) whether ‘extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant such a reduction’; and (2) ‘the [sentencing] factors set forth in [§] 3553(a) to the extent that they are applicable.’” *United States v. Keller*, 2 F.4th 1278, 1283–84 (9th Cir. 2021) (per curiam) (quoting 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i)). Each step of this analysis qualifies as an independent ground to deny a motion for compassionate release. *See id.* at 1284 (“[A] district court that properly *denies* compassionate release need not evaluate each step.”).

The district court denied Goodall’s motion solely based on its analysis of the § 3553(a) factors. The only argument Goodall makes regarding this analysis is that the district court should have concluded that the term of imprisonment he has already served is sufficient to satisfy the purposes of sentencing under § 3553(a). But Goodall “cites no authority for this proposition, nor does he offer any analysis beyond this unsupported conclusion.” *Singh v. Am. Honda Fin. Corp.*, 925 F.3d 1053, 1075 n.22 (9th Cir. 2019). Thus, Goodall does not adequately raise any challenge to the district court’s § 3553(a) analysis on appeal. *See id.*; *Freedom From Religion Found., Inc. v. Chino Valley Unified Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ.*, 896 F.3d 1132,

1152 (9th Cir. 2018) (per curiam) (issues not raised on appeal are waived).

Because the district court's § 3553(a) analysis provides an independent ground to deny Goodall's motion for compassionate release, we affirm on that basis and do not address Goodall's arguments related to the district court's extraordinary-and-compelling-reasons analysis. *See Keller*, 2 F.4th at 1284; *Freedom From Religion Found., Inc.*, 896 F.3d at 1152.

**AFFIRMED.**