## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**FILED** 

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 11 2025

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

## FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JAMES W. MILLEGAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 24-7441

D.C. No.

3:19-cr-00528-IM-1

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Oregon Karin J. Immergut, District Judge, Presiding

> Submitted June 9, 2025\*\* Portland, Oregon

Before: TALLMAN, OWENS, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Defendant James W. Millegan appeals from the district court's denial of his motion to reduce his sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) and Amendment 821 to the United States Sentencing Guidelines. We review the denial of Millegan's

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).

motion under § 3582(c)(2) for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Hernandez-Martinez*, 933 F.3d 1126, 1131 (9th Cir. 2019). As the parties are familiar with the facts, we do not recount them here. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

"The district court's duty to consider the § 3553(a) factors necessarily entails a duty to provide a sufficient explanation of the sentencing decision to permit meaningful appellate review." *United States v. Trujillo*, 713 F.3d 1003, 1009 (9th Cir. 2013). Even if the district court abused its discretion by not adequately explaining its rejection of Millegan's arguments, any error was harmless. *See United States v. Cruz-Gramajo*, 570 F.3d 1162, 1167 (9th Cir. 2009). The record shows the district court considered the parties' arguments, believed that the original 51-month sentence was appropriate in light of Millegan's conduct (including during the pendency of his case), and found that his individual circumstances did not show a decreased likelihood of recidivism. *See Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 585 U.S. 109, 120 (2018).

## AFFIRMED.

2 24-7441