

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 26-1442

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Cody Kinzie Dittmar

Defendant - Appellant

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

Submitted: October 13, 2026

Filed: October 20, 2026

[Unpublished]

Before L.R. SMITH, BENTON, and TRAYNOR, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Cody Dittmar appeals after the district court¹ revoked his supervised release and sentenced him to 24 months in prison. His counsel has moved to withdraw and

¹The Honorable C.J. Williams, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Northern District of Iowa.

has filed a brief primarily considering whether there was a factual basis for violations of his supervised release and whether the sentence was substantively unreasonable. Dittmar has filed a pro se supplement asserting errors in a related proceeding.

Upon careful review, we conclude that the district court did not err in determining that Dittmar violated the conditions of release. See United States v. Miller, 557 F.3d 910, 914 (8th Cir. 2009) (factual findings as to whether violation occurred reviewed for clear error). We further conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in sentencing Dittmar. See United States v. Valure, 835 F.3d 789, 790 (8th Cir. 2016) (revocation sentence reviewed for abuse of discretion). The record reflects that the district court adequately considered the relevant factors and did not give significant weight to an improper factor or commit a clear error of judgment in imposing a 24-month term based primarily on Dittmar's problematic history on supervised release. See United States v. Pratt, 142 F.4th 1090, 1094-95 (8th Cir. 2025) (sentence may be unreasonable if district court fails to consider relevant factor, gives significant weight to improper factor, or commits clear error of judgment; court may consider history on supervised release). To the extent Dittmar suggests that errors in another proceeding impacted some of the violations, we deem any error harmless in light of the other violations and the district court's statements concerning the revocation sentence. See United States v. Cates, 613 F.3d 856, 859 (8th Cir. 2010) (error concerning revocation sentence was harmless where district court declared it would have imposed same sentence).

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