

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 25-1690

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Craig James Myran

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the District of Minnesota

Submitted: October 31, 2025

Filed: November 5, 2025

[Unpublished]

Before LOKEN, GRUENDER, and ERICKSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Craig James Myran appeals after a jury found him guilty of advertising child pornography, distributing child pornography, and possessing child pornography

involving a prepubescent minor; and the district court¹ sentenced him to 262 months in prison. Myran's counsel moved to withdraw and filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), challenging the sufficiency of the evidence, the imposition of a sentencing enhancement for obstruction of justice, and the substantive reasonableness of the sentence. On September 25, we entered an order granting counsel's motion to withdraw and granting Myran leave to file a *pro se* brief on or before October 27. On October 27, without filing a *pro se* brief, Myran filed a motion for appointment of new counsel. We deny the motion for appointment of counsel and affirm the judgment of the district court.

We conclude that the district court did not plainly err by submitting the charged offenses to the jury, as the evidence that Myran knowingly advertised, distributed, and possessed visual depictions of minors engaging in sexually explicit conduct was not so tenuous as to make his convictions shocking. See United States v. Calhoun, 721 F.3d 596, 600 (8th Cir. 2013) (standard of review). We conclude, moreover, that the district court made sufficient factual findings to support the obstruction-of-justice enhancement. See United States v. Garcia, 61 F.4th 628, 631-32 (8th Cir. 2023); United States v. Shelabarger, 770 F.3d 714, 716-19 (8th Cir. 2014). Finally, on abuse-of-discretion review, we conclude that Myran's sentence was not substantively unreasonable, as the district court properly considered the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), and there is no indication that the court overlooked a relevant factor, gave significant weight to an improper factor, or committed a clear error of judgment in weighing relevant factors. See United States v. Townsend, 617 F.3d 991, 994 (8th Cir. 2010) (per curiam); see also United States v. Timberlake, 679 F.3d 1008, 1012 (8th Cir. 2012).

¹The Honorable Eric C. Tostrud, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

We have independently reviewed the record under Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), and have found no non-frivolous issues for appeal. Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is affirmed.
