NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. VAUGHN MAURICE WOODEN, Defendant-Appellant.	No. 14-50438 D.C. No. 8:10-cr-00035-DOC MEMORANDUM[*]

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
David O. Carter, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 18, 2017[**]

Before: TROTT, TASHIMA, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Vaughn Maurice Wooden appeals from the district court's judgment and challenges the sentence imposed upon revocation of supervised release to the extent it required him to serve six months in a residential reentry center ("RRC") as part of his supervised release term. We dismiss.

[*] This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

[**] The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Wooden contends the district court procedurally erred by basing the RRC condition on the clearly erroneous finding that Wooden had intentionally violated the previous RRC condition and because the RRC condition allegedly conflicts with the sentencing options presented to Wooden by the district court. Because Wooden has satisfied the six-month RRC condition, and any decision in this appeal would have no effect on the length of his supervised release term, we dismiss the appeal as moot. *See United States v. Strong*, 489 F.3d 1055, 1059 (9th Cir. 2007) ("An appeal is moot when, by virtue of an intervening event, a court of appeals cannot grant any effectual relief whatever in favor of the appellant." (internal quotation marks omitted)).

DISMISSED.