

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-3020

September Term, 2022

1:23-cr-00025-BAH-1

Filed On: March 28, 2023

United States of America,

Appellee

v.

Michael Blackson,

Appellant

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BEFORE: Pillard, Childs, and Pan, Circuit Judges

J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the memoranda of law and fact filed by the parties. The court has determined that the issues presented occasion no need for an opinion. See D.C. Cir. Rule 36. It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's February 6, 2023 detention order be affirmed. Appellant has not shown that the district court required more than a "reasonable assurance" that the community would be safe if he were released under the conditions ordered by the magistrate judge. See *United States v. Munchel*, 991 F.3d 1273, 1283 (D.C. Cir. 2021). Nor has appellant demonstrated that the district court clearly erred in finding that no condition or combination of conditions of release would reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community. See 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(1); *United States v. Hale-Cusanelli*, 3 F.4th 449, 454-55 (D.C. Cir. 2021). Given this finding, the district court was not required to make further specific findings on the record with respect to the likely effectiveness of the release conditions that the magistrate judge had deemed sufficient. See *United States v. Mink*, No. 22-3007, 2022 WL 1193670, at *1 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 21, 2022) (per curiam); *United States v. Brown*, No. 21-3063, 2021 WL 5537705, at *1 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 17, 2021) (per curiam); *United States v. Quaglin*, 851 F. App'x 218, 219 (D.C. Cir. 2021) (per curiam). And in any event, the district court did address the proposed conditions of release, and appellant has not shown that the district court clearly erred in finding them insufficient to reasonably assure the safety of the community. See *Hale-Cusanelli*, 3 F.4th at 455.

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 23-3020

September Term, 2022

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/

Daniel J. Reidy

Deputy Clerk