**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

FILED

NOV 3 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

| | |
|---|---|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,<br><br>Plaintiff - Appellee,<br><br>v.<br><br>LORRIE ELMER MECHAM,<br><br>Defendant - Appellant. | No. 26-275<br><br>D.C. No.<br>1:08-cr-00172-DCN-1<br><br>MEMORANDUM[*] |

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Idaho
David C. Nye, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 27, 2026[**]

Before: SILVERMAN, FORREST, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Lorrie Elmer Mecham appeals from the district court's judgment revoking supervised release and imposing a sentence of 3 months' imprisonment. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

Mecham contends that the district court abused its discretion by revoking his

[*] 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).

supervised release without considering whether revocation was appropriate under U.S.S.G. § 7C1.3(b). The court did not abuse its discretion. *See United States v. Hilger*, 728 F.3d 947, 951 (9th Cir. 2013). In his sentencing papers and at the revocation hearing, Mecham cited the updated Chapter 7 policy statements and argued in favor of ordering individualized treatment rather than revoking supervision. The court considered this argument but disagreed, electing to revoke and concluding that there was no reason to go "lower than the end" of the undisputed Guidelines range given the testimony establishing that Mecham was unwilling to engage in treatment. Contrary to Mecham's argument, this record reflects that the court conducted an individualized assessment of whether to revoke supervised release, *see* U.S.S.G. § 7C1.3(b), and it did not abuse its discretion in deciding to revoke.

**AFFIRMED.**