

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 29 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 25-5721

Plaintiff - Appellee,

D.C. No.

v.

2:09-cr-00678-JAT-1

STEPHEN ROSS RABOY, AKA Steven
Raboy, AKA Steven Rayboy, AKA Stephen
Raboy,

MEMORANDUM*

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
James A. Teilborg, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 26, 2026**

Before: S.R. THOMAS, MILLER, and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Stephen Ross Raboy appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion for sentence reduction 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*

* 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)*.

States v. Keller, 2 F.4th 1278, 1281 (9th Cir. 2021), we affirm.

The parties dispute whether Raboy exhausted his administrative remedies before filing his motion. We need not decide this issue because the record shows that, even if Raboy exhausted, the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Raboy's motion.

Contrary to Raboy's contention, the record reflects that the district court fully considered each of his arguments for relief. To the extent Raboy faults the district court for failing to consider the aggregate force of his asserted extraordinary and compelling reasons, we find no error in the court's thorough explanation, which reflects that it would not have reached a different conclusion even if it had explicitly considered Raboy's arguments in the aggregate. *See United States v. Wright*, 46 F.4th 938, 952 (9th Cir. 2022) (holding that the district court did not err in failing to address the defendant's arguments for compassionate release in greater detail where it otherwise adequately explained its decision). Furthermore, Raboy has not shown any abuse of discretion in the court's conclusions that he lacked extraordinary and compelling reasons and that the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors did not support relief. *See United States v. Robertson*, 895 F.3d 1206, 1213 (9th Cir. 2018) (district court abuses its discretion only if its decision is illogical, implausible, or not supported by the record).

AFFIRMED.