

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 24-3615

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Aaron Lamonte Miles

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Southern District of Iowa - Eastern

Submitted: June 9, 2025

Filed: June 12, 2025

[Unpublished]

Before SHEPHERD, ERICKSON, and GRASZ, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Aaron Miles appeals after the district court¹ revoked his supervised release. His counsel has moved to withdraw and has filed a brief challenging the sufficiency of the evidence and the substantive reasonableness of the sentence.

Having reviewed the record, we conclude the district court did not clearly err by finding that the government proved the contested violations by a preponderance of the evidence. See United States v. Staten, 990 F.3d 631, 635 (8th Cir. 2021) (per curiam) (this court reviews factual findings as to whether revocation violations occurred for clear error, and will not reverse unless we have a definite and firm conviction that the district court was mistaken). In making those findings, the court did not plainly err by considering hearsay statements. See United States v. Simms, 757 F.3d 728, 733-34 (8th Cir. 2014) (reviewing challenge to hearsay statements for plain error when defendant did not object in district court); see also United States v. Hernandez, 281 F.3d 746, 748 (8th Cir. 2002) (findings on witness credibility are virtually unreviewable on appeal).

We further conclude that the district court did not err by revoking supervised release, see Staten, 990 F.3d at 635 (reviewing decision to revoke supervision for an abuse of discretion), and did not impose an unreasonable sentence. The record reflects that the court sufficiently considered the relevant statutory sentencing factors and did not overlook a relevant factor, give significant weight to an improper or irrelevant factor, or commit a clear error of judgment in weighing relevant factors. See 18 U.S.C. §§ 3553(a); 3583(e); United States v. Wilkins, 909 F.3d 915, 917 (8th Cir. 2018) (reviewing substantive reasonableness of revocation sentence for an abuse of discretion). The sentence is also within both the statutory limits and the advisory range of the Sentencing Guidelines. See 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3), (k); Wilkins, 909 F.3d at 917.

¹The Honorable Stephanie M. Rose, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa.

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment, and we grant counsel's motion to withdraw.
