

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-5181**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KENISHCA WALIZADA,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:10-cr-00148-CMH-1)

---

Submitted: June 29, 2011

Decided: July 7, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Cary S. Greenberg, Caroline E. Costle, GREENBERGCOSTLE, P.C., McLean, Virginia, for Appellant. Neil H. MacBride, United States Attorney, William H. Jones, II, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Gordon D. Kromberg, Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kenishca Walizada appeals his jury conviction for structuring financial transactions to evade reporting requirements, in violation of 31 U.S.C. § 5313(a) (2006). The court sentenced Walizada to two years' probation. We affirm.

Walizada argues that the evidence was not sufficient to support the jury's finding that he had structured or attempted to structure a financial transaction and that the language of the Code of Federal Regulations defining a structured transaction is ambiguous. This Court reviews a sufficiency of the evidence challenge by determining whether, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the Government, the trial evidence "could support any rational determination of guilty beyond a reasonable doubt." United States v. Young, 609 F.3d 348, 355 (4th Cir. 2010). The evidence adduced at trial was clearly sufficient to support the jury's verdict. Further, we reject Walizada's contention that the language in the applicable regulations is ambiguous.

We therefore affirm Walizada's conviction and sentence. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED