

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JAN 17 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 17-10524

Plaintiff-Appellee,

D.C. No. 2:10-cr-00217-RFB-1

v.

MEMORANDUM*

DRAGOMIR TASKOV, a.k.a. Drago,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Nevada
Richard F. Boulware II, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 15, 2019**

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

Dragomir Taskov appeals pro se from the district court's order substituting and forfeiting assets pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.2. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

Taskov contends that he did not receive notice of the forfeiture or an

* 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).

opportunity to challenge it. He also contends that the property subject to the forfeiture was unconstitutionally seized and that the statutes of conviction in his case do not support forfeiture. Taskov waived these arguments by failing to raise them in his prior appeal from the judgment ordering forfeiture. *See United States v. Nagra*, 147 F.3d 875, 882 (9th Cir. 1998). To the extent that Taskov challenges the district court's substitution and forfeiture order, the district court properly determined that the government satisfied the requirements of Rule 32.2 and 21 U.S.C. § 853(p).

AFFIRMED.