

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

No. 09-41238

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

June 10, 2014

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

In re: AMY UNKNOWN,

Petitioner

Consolidated with 09-41254

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

DOYLE RANDALL PAROLINE,

Defendant-Appellee

v.

AMY UNKNOWN,

Movant-Appellant

No. 09-31215

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

MICHAEL WRIGHT

Defendant-Appellant

No. 09–41238
c/w No. 09–41254
No. 09–31215

Appeals from the United States District Courts
for the Eastern District of Texas
and the Eastern District of Louisiana

ON REMAND FROM
THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Before STEWART, Chief Judge, and KING, JOLLY, DAVIS, JONES, SMITH, GARZA, DENNIS, CLEMENT, PRADO, OWEN, ELROD, SOUTHWICK, HAYNES, and GRAVES, Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, the en banc court affirmed the Eastern District of Louisiana’s judgment in *United States v. Wright*, No. 09–CR–103 (E.D. La. Dec. 16, 2009), and vacated the Eastern District of Texas’s judgment in *United States v. Paroline*, 672 F.Supp.2d 781 (E.D. Tex. 2009). *In re Amy Unknown*, 701 F.3d 749 (5th Cir. 2012) (en banc). The Supreme Court subsequently vacated our judgment and remanded, holding that 18 U.S.C. § 2259 requires “restitution in an amount that comports with the defendant’s relative role in the causal process that underlies the victim’s general losses.” *Paroline v. United States*, 134 S. Ct. 1710, 1727 (2014). Likewise, in *Wright v. United States*, 134 S. Ct. 1933 (2014), the Court vacated our judgment in light of *Paroline*.

* Judge Higginson is recused and did not participate in any aspect of the en banc rehearing. Judge Costa did not participate in the en banc rehearing or in this decision.

No. 09–41238
c/w No. 09–41254
No. 09–31215

Accordingly, we VACATE the restitution order of the Eastern District of Texas, VACATE the restitution order of the Eastern District of Louisiana, and REMAND for proceedings consistent with the Supreme Court’s opinion.¹

¹ Michael Wright’s Motion to Remand in No. 09-31215 is denied as moot.