

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25-11084
Non-Argument Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

TRENTON EDWARD WATKINS,

Defendant- Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Alabama
D.C. Docket No. 1:12-cr-00291-TFM-N-1

Before LUCK, LAGOA, and BLACK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Trenton Watkins appeals his 24-month sentence following the revocation of his supervised release. He contends the district court imposed a substantively unreasonable sentence because the

sentence was inconsistent with the district court's sympathetic warnings to him at the revocation hearing. After review,¹ we affirm.

Upon finding by a preponderance of the evidence that a defendant has violated a condition of supervised release, a district court may revoke the term of supervised release and impose a term of imprisonment after considering certain factors in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). *United States v. Sweeting*, 437 F.3d 1105, 1107 (11th Cir. 2006). The relevant factors that a court must consider before imposing a sentence upon revocation are: (1) the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; (2) the need for deterrence; (3) the need to protect the public from the defendant's further crimes; (4) the need to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training or medical care; (5) the relevant Guidelines range; (6) the pertinent policy statements of the Sentencing Commission; (7) the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities; and (8) the need to provide restitution to victims. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e) (citing 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(B)-(D), (a)(4)-(7)).

In considering the § 3553(a) factors at sentencing, the district court may attach greater weight to one factor over others. *United States v. Williams*, 526 F.3d 1312, 1322 (11th Cir. 2008). After the sentencing judge considers the arguments of both parties and the

¹ We review the substantive reasonableness of a district court's sentence upon revoking supervised release for abuse of discretion. *United States v. Traylor*, 827 F.3d 933, 935-36 (11th Cir. 2016).

25-11084

Opinion of the Court

3

§ 3553(a) factors, the judge may impose a sentence deviating from the Guidelines so long as they adequately explain the justification for the variance. *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 50 (2007). We “must give due deference to the district court’s decision that the § 3553(a) factors, on a whole, justify the extent of the variance.” *Id.* at 51.

Watkins failed to meet his burden of establishing that the district court imposed a substantively unreasonable sentence. *See United States v. Tome*, 611 F.3d 1371, 1378 (11th Cir. 2010) (stating the party challenging the sentence bears the burden to show it is unreasonable based on the § 3553(a) factors and the facts of the case). The district court emphasized Watkins’ need for anger management training and the danger associated with domestic violence. Watkins contends the district court failed to adequately weigh these issues as mitigating factors. However, it was not unreasonable for the district court to place more weight on deterrence and the protection of the public. *See Williams*, 526 F.3d at 1322; 18 U.S.C. §§ 3553(a)(2)(B), (C), 3583(e). Watkins was undeterred by the previous 24-month sentence because both sentences imposed upon revocation of supervised release stemmed in part from Watkins’ acts of domestic violence. *See Williams*, 526 F.3d at 1322. Additionally, the district court adequately explained the justification for the upward variance of 12 months above Watkins’ advisory Guidelines range. *See Gall*, 552 U.S. at 50. Accordingly, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.