

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 18 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 17-50265

Plaintiff-Appellee,

D.C. No. 2:16-cr-00188-GW

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

ARTIOM ALABILIKIAN,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
George H. Wu, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 15, 2018\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, BEA, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

Artiom Alabilikian appeals from the district court's judgment and challenges his guilty-plea convictions and aggregate 47-month sentence for conspiracy to commit bank fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1349; bank fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1344; conspiracy to unlawfully possess access devices, in violation of 18

---

\* 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).

U.S.C. § 1029(b)(2); unlawful possession of 15 or more unauthorized access devices, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1029(a)(3); and aggravated identity theft, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1). Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Alabilikian’s counsel has filed a brief stating that there are no grounds for relief, along with a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. We have provided Alabilikian the opportunity to file a pro se supplemental brief. No pro se supplemental brief or answering brief has been filed.

Our independent review of the record pursuant to *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), discloses no arguable grounds for relief on direct appeal as to Alabilikian’s conviction and sentence, with the exception of the three supervised release conditions discussed below.

Standard conditions five, six, and fourteen are unconstitutionally vague. *See United States v. Evans*, 883 F.3d 1154, 1162-64 (9th Cir. 2018). We remand for the district court to modify these conditions consistent with our opinion in *Evans*.

Counsel’s motion to withdraw is **GRANTED**.

**AFFIRMED; REMANDED with instructions.**