

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-4754

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ABDI RAZAQ ABSHIR OSMAN, a/k/a Abdirasaq Abshir,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 16-4756

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MOHAMED ABDI JAMA, a/k/a Mohammed Abdi Jamah,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 16-4758

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ABDICASIIS CABAASE, a/k/a Ahmed Mahomood,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 17-4274

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MOHAMED FARAH, a/k/a Mahamed Farraah Hassan,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (2:10-cr-00057-RAJ-DEM-5; 2:10-cr-00057-RAJ-DEM-2; 2:10-cr-00057-RAJ-DEM-4; 2:10-cr-00057-RAJ-DEM-6)

Submitted: November 17, 2017

Decided: December 6, 2017

Before KING, KEENAN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Trey R. Kelleter, VANDEVENTER BLACK LLP, Norfolk, Virginia; Jason Alan Dunn, JASON A. DUNN, PLC, Virginia Beach, Virginia; Lawrence H. Woodward, Jr., SHUTTLEWORTH, RULOFF, SWAIN, HADDAD & MORECOCK, P.C., Virginia Beach, Virginia; Robert B. Rigney, PROTOGYROU & RIGNEY, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellants. Dana J. Boente, United States Attorney, Richard D. Cooke, Assistant United

States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Abdi Razaq Abshir Osman, Mohamed Abdi Jama, Abdicasiis Cabaase, and Mohamed Farah (collectively, “Defendants”) appeal their convictions and life sentences for piracy, in violation 18 U.S.C. § 1651 (2012).^{*} We conclude that Defendants’ challenges to their convictions and life sentences are barred by the law-of-the-case doctrine because we previously considered and rejected Defendants’ arguments in *United States v. Said*, 798 F.3d 182, 193, 198-200 (4th Cir. 2015). *See United States v. Aramony*, 166 F.3d 655, 661 (4th Cir. 1999) (describing law-of-the-case doctrine and its exceptions). Accordingly, we affirm the amended judgments of the district court. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

^{*} Defendants also were convicted of and sentenced for other offenses, but they do not challenge those convictions or sentences on appeal.