

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

No. 16-20624
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

June 14, 2017

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

MOHAMMED TAIMOOR RAZA,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:14-CR-473-1

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, PRADO, and HAYNES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Mohammed Taimoor Raza appeals the revocation of his supervised release. Raza had pleaded guilty to being an illegal alien in possession of a firearm and was sentenced to time served and three years of supervised release. One of the special conditions of supervision that Raza violated was that he would “provide travel information and follow through with exiting the United States under immigration officials’ supervision.”

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 16-20624

The appropriate guidelines range was 5 to 11 months in prison for the revocation. The district court found that Raza had made no attempt to contact his parents to secure the information necessary to secure travel documents and told the probation officer that he, Raza, had no intention of getting the documents necessary for his deportation. The court departed from the guidelines and sentenced Raza to two years in prison.

On appeal Raza challenges the imposition of the above-guidelines sentence. We review a sentence imposed on revocation of supervised release under the plainly unreasonable standard, applying a two-step process. *United States v. Warren*, 720 F.3d 321, 326 (5th Cir. 2013). First, we ensure that the district court did not commit significant procedural error, such as selecting a sentence based on clearly erroneous facts. *Id.* If there is no procedural error, we then consider the substantive reasonableness of the sentence. *Id.* Raza argues that the sentence is based on the district court's unfounded beliefs and assumptions. He has not shown that any of the factual findings supporting his sentence are clearly erroneous and has not shown a procedural error in his sentencing. *See id.* Nor has Raza shown that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an unreasonable sentence. *See United States v. Heard*, 709 F.3d 413, 435 (5th Cir. 2013); *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007).

AFFIRMED.