

# United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 19-3084

September Term, 2019

1:15-cr-00126-RDM-1

Filed On: August 12, 2020

United States of America,

Appellee

v.

Laquinn Williams,

Appellant

## ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**BEFORE:** Henderson, Tatel, and Katsas, Circuit Judges

### J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and the briefs of the parties. The court has determined that the issues present no need for an opinion. See D.C. Cir. Rule 36(d). It is

**ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the order of the district court entered October 22, 2019, finding that appellant violated the terms of his supervised release and modifying the conditions of his supervised release, be affirmed. Appellant's challenge to the condition of home confinement is moot as the period of home confinement expired in January 2020 and he has not alleged any collateral consequences of the home confinement. Additionally, appellant did not challenge the location-monitoring condition in the district court, and he has failed to show on appeal that location monitoring is "so plainly out of sync with the statutory goals enumerated in [18 U.S.C.] § 3553(a) as to warrant reversal." United States v. Burroughs, 613 F.3d 233, 240 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (internal quotations omitted).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to issue the mandate forthwith.

### Per Curiam

**FOR THE COURT:**  
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/  
Daniel J. Reidy  
Deputy Clerk