

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 25-1883

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Randle Snell

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the District of Minnesota

Submitted: March 3, 2026

Filed: March 9, 2026

[Unpublished]

Before BENTON, KELLY, and ERICKSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Randle Snell appeals after the district court¹ revoked his supervised release and sentenced him to 20 months in prison and 2 years of supervised release. On appeal, Snell argues that the district court imposed a substantively unreasonable sentence.

After careful review of the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in sentencing Snell, as it considered the facts of the violation conduct and the parties' arguments, and there was no indication that it committed a clear error of judgment in weighing relevant factors. See United States v. Miller, 557 F.3d 910, 915-18 (8th Cir. 2009) (substantive reasonableness of revocation sentence is reviewed under deferential abuse-of-discretion standard); see also United States v. Gray, 533 F.3d 942, 943-44 (8th Cir. 2008) (judges are presumed to know law and understand obligation to consider 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors; in determining whether court considered relevant factors, this court reviews entire sentencing record, not merely court's statements at hearing); United States v. White Face, 383 F.3d 733, 740 (8th Cir. 2004) (district court need not mechanically list every § 3553(a) factor when sentencing defendant upon revocation; all that is required is consideration of relevant matters and some reason for court's decision).

Accordingly, we affirm.

¹The Honorable Michael J. Davis, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.