

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 22 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SCOT SUTHERLAND HAINES,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 25-19

D.C. No.

3:21-cr-00168-SI-1

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Oregon
Michael H. Simon, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 15, 2025**

Before: FRIEDLAND, MILLER, and SANCHEZ, Circuit Judges.

Scot Sutherland Haines appeals from the district court's order denying his motion for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. Reviewing for abuse of discretion, *see United States v. Keller*, 2 F.4th 1278, 1281 (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).

Haines contends the district court erred by insufficiently explaining its analysis of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) sentencing factors. The record belies this claim. After quoting extensively from the government’s opposition, which discussed Haines’s criminal history, offense conduct, and multiple violations and arrests while on pretrial release, the court found that “a reduction in Mr. Haines’ sentence of imprisonment would undermine the sentencing factors identified by Congress in [1]8 U.S.C. § 3553(a).” This record provides sufficient explanation. *See Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 585 U.S. 109, 115-17 (2018). Moreover, “[g]iven [Haines’s] extensive criminal history, as well as the deference we must afford the district court when it makes these discretionary decisions, we cannot conclude that the district court abused its discretion with this finding.” *Keller*, 2 F.4th at 1284. Lastly, contrary to Haines’s argument, the court was not required to address whether he had extraordinary and compelling circumstances. *See id.* (explaining that “a district court that properly *denies* compassionate release need not evaluate each step”).

AFFIRMED.