

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 25-3181

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Alexander B. Evans, also known as Alexander Evans

Defendant - Appellant

No. 25-3182

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Alexander B. Evans, also known as Alexander Evans

Defendant - Appellant

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

Submitted: June 4, 2026
Filed: June 12, 2026
[Unpublished]

Before LOKEN, SMITH, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated proceedings, Alexander Evans appeals the sentences the district court¹ imposed after he pled guilty to receipt of child pornography, and his supervised release for a prior offense was revoked. His counsel has moved for leave to withdraw and has filed a brief citing Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), challenging the substantive reasonableness of both sentences.

Upon careful review, we conclude that neither sentence was an abuse of discretion, see United States v. Valure, 835 F.3d 789, 790 (8th Cir. 2016) (sentence reviewed for abuse of discretion), as the record reflects that the district court adequately considered the relevant sentencing factors and did not give significant weight to an improper factor or commit a clear error of judgment in weighing the relevant factors, see United States v. Larison, 432 F.3d 921, 923-24 (8th Cir. 2006) (sentence may be unreasonable if district court fails to consider relevant factor, gives significant weight to improper factor, or commits clear error of judgment). Regarding the new sentence, we reject Evans's challenge to the weight the court assigned to some factors over others in arriving at a within-Guidelines sentence of 324 months in prison. See United States v. Maluoth, 121 F.4th 1158, 1165 (8th Cir. 2024) (simply because court weighed relevant factors more heavily than others does not mean there was abuse of discretion); see also United States v. Foard, 108 F.4th 729,

¹The Honorable Stephen H. Locher, United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa.

738 (8th Cir. 2024) (within-Guidelines term presumptively reasonable). Concerning the revocation sentence, we discern no error as to the court's imposition of an above-Guidelines term of 24 months in prison primarily based on Evans's history on supervised release. See United States v. Michels, 49 F.4th 1146, 1148-49 (8th Cir. 2022) (it will be unusual case when appellate court reverses sentence as unreasonable, whether within, above, or below Guidelines range; no abuse of discretion in imposing above-Guidelines revocation sentence based on supervision issues).

Following review under Penon v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we have found no nonfrivolous issues. We thus grant counsel's motion to withdraw and affirm.
