

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 25-3133

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Ronnie Gideon

Defendant - Appellant

No. 25-3134

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Ronnie Gideon

Defendant - Appellant

Appeals from United States District Court
for the Western District of Missouri - Springfield

Submitted: September 15, 2026
Filed: October 6, 2026
[Unpublished]

Before L.R. SMITH, GRUENDER, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated proceedings, Ronnie Gideon appeals the sentences imposed by the district court¹ following his guilty pleas in separate cases to receipt and distribution of child pornography. His counsel has moved for leave to withdraw and filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), challenging the substantive reasonableness of the sentences. Gideon has filed pro se supplements, challenging other aspects of his sentences and suggesting the district court erred when it failed to sua sponte order the return of his electronic devices.

Regarding the challenge in the Anders brief, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion, as there is no indication the court overlooked a relevant factor, gave significant weight to an improper factor, or committed a clear error of judgment in weighing the factors when it arrived at below-Guidelines prison terms premised on the nature of Gideon's offenses compared to his arguments in mitigation. See United States v. Feemster, 572 F.3d 455, 461-62 (8th Cir. 2009) (en banc) (discussing standard of review and considerations for sentence reasonableness).

¹The Honorable M. Douglas Harpool, United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

As to the arguments in Gideon’s supplements, we discern no plain error in the district court’s brief reference to Gideon receiving “help,” see United States v. Clark, 998 F.3d 363, 368 (8th Cir. 2021) (no plain error where nothing in record indicated sentence was lengthened to complete treatment), and no plain error as to the explanation for the term of supervised release, see United States v. Floss, 42 F.4th 854, 863 (8th Cir. 2022) (no plain error regarding supervision term because district court provided consideration of factors embracing entirety of sentence). We further conclude there was no error concerning the announcement of the conditions of supervised release, see United States v. White Bull, 646 F.3d 1082, 1096-97 (8th Cir. 2011) (no error where circumstances showed defendant received sufficient notice), and no plain error regarding the explanation for the conditions of release, see United States v. Jackson, 33 F.4th 523, 528-29 (8th Cir. 2022) (per curiam) (no plain error concerning explanation for condition where basis can be discerned from record). Finally, we deem any challenge to the restitution judgments waived, see United States v. Sukhtipyaroge, 1 F.4th 603, 606-07 (8th Cir. 2021) (restitution-related argument waived where challenge on appeal was “polar opposite” of position argued below), and we find no error on the district court’s part in failing to sua sponte order the return of Gideon’s electronic devices, see United States v. Mendez, 860 F.3d 1147, 1150 (8th Cir. 2017) (discussing availability of return of property via motion).

Having independently reviewed the record pursuant to Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), we have found no nonfrivolous issues. Accordingly, we grant counsel leave to withdraw, and affirm the judgments.