

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 25 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TRACY JEAN BELL,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 26-709

D.C. No.

9:22-cr-00023-DLC-1

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Montana
Dana L. Christensen, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 22, 2026**

Before: OWENS, COLLINS, and SUNG, Circuit Judges.

Tracy Jean Bell appeals from the district court's order denying his motion for a 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 States v. Wright*, 46 F.4th 938, 944 (9th Cir. 2022), 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).

Bell contends that the court abused its discretion by concluding that his serious health problems, which include progressively worsening Parkinson’s disease and heart disease requiring pacemaker surgery, did not constitute extraordinary and compelling reasons for compassionate release. After reviewing Bell’s medical records, the district court concluded that Bell’s medical conditions, though “serious,” did not support compassionate release because he was receiving regular medical care in prison and the delay in scheduling his pacemaker surgery was not unreasonable. Given the record before it, the court did not abuse its discretion in reaching this conclusion. *See id.* (district court abuses its discretion only if its decision is illogical, implausible, or lacks support in the record).

Moreover, any error in the district court’s extraordinary and compelling analysis was harmless because it reasonably concluded that Bell’s criminal history made him a danger to society and that completion of his full sentence—which accounted for his physical condition and age—best served the aims of sentencing under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). *See Wright*, 46 F.4th at 947 (“[W]hen a district court properly denies a compassionate release motion on at least one ground, improper considerations at other steps of this analysis have no effect on the final disposition.”). Bell’s “mere disagreement” with the court’s treatment of the § 3553(a) factors is insufficient to show an abuse of discretion. *See id.* at 948.

AFFIRMED.