

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 1 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SABIR SHABAZZ,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 25-7838

D.C. No.

2:12-cr-00033-JLR-1

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
James L. Robart, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 25, 2026**

Before: SILVERMAN, N.R. SMITH, and DE ALBA, Circuit Judges.

Sabir Shabazz appeals from the district court's order denying his motion for a sentence reduction under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

The district court agreed with the parties that Shabazz was eligible for a

* 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).

sentence reduction under Amendment 821 to U.S.S.G. § 4A1.1, which lowered the applicable Guidelines range. The court determined, however, that the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors did not support a reduction in Shabazz's 32-year sentence. *See Dillon v. United States*, 560 U.S. 817, 826-27 (2010) (describing the two-step process for evaluating a § 3582(c)(2) motion).

Shabazz contends the district court insufficiently engaged with his arguments and the § 3553(a) factors. To the contrary, the court explained that the seriousness of Shabazz's offenses and their continued impacts outweighed Shabazz's asserted remorse and rehabilitation. It further explained that, given Shabazz's particular conduct, his existing sentence did not result in any unwarranted sentencing disparities. The court addressed Shabazz's arguments and adequately explained its reasoning, and it did not abuse its discretion in denying relief. *See United States v. Wilson*, 8 F.4th 970, 975, 976-78 (9th Cir. 2021).

AFFIRMED.