

FILED

MAR 15 2022

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

JOHN LANNY LYNCH,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 17-35794

D.C. Nos. 9:16-cv-00156-DWM
9:99-cr-00018-DWM-1

MEMORANDUM*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

JOSEPH BERNARD WRIGHT,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 17-35795

D.C. Nos. 9:16-cv-00085-DWM
9:11-cr-00017-DWM-1

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the District of Montana
Donald W. Molloy, District Judge, Presiding

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

JACOB KRAUS,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 17-36003

D.C. Nos. 1:16-cv-00090-SPW
1:08-cr-00014-SPW-3

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

CHUOI SAM,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 17-36004

D.C. Nos. 1:16-cv-00089-SPW
1:05-cr-00052-SPW-2

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

YURI CHACHANKO,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 17-36007

D.C. Nos. 1:16-cv-00096-SPW
1:05-cr-00052-SPW-1

ROLANDO PEREZ,

No. 18-35070

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent-Appellee.

D.C. Nos. 1:16-cv-00100-SPW
1:06-cr-00026-SPW-1

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the District of Montana
Susan P. Watters, District Judge, Presiding

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

STEVEN ALEXANDER ACTON,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 18-35087

D.C. Nos. 9:16-cv-00077-DLC
9:12-cr-00017-DLC-1

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Montana
Dana L. Christensen, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 9, 2021**
Seattle, Washington

** The panel unanimously concludes these cases are suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Before: McKEOWN and BADE, Circuit Judges, and FITZWATER,*** District Judge.

Defendants-appellants appeal the denials of their motions under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to vacate, set aside, or correct their 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) convictions and sentences. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1291 and 2253. We review de novo the denial of a § 2255 motion, *United States v. Aguirre-Ganceda*, 592 F.3d 1043, 1045 (9th Cir. 2010), and we affirm.

Defendants-appellants' contention that aiding and abetting Hobbs Act robbery is not a crime of violence under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(3)(A) is foreclosed by our precedent. *See Young v. United States*, 22 F.4th 1115, 1122–23 (9th Cir. 2022) (explaining that there is “no distinction between aiding-and-abetting liability and liability as a principal under federal law[,]” and holding that “aiding and abetting a crime of violence, such as armed bank robbery, is also a crime of violence”). Because Hobbs Act robbery is a crime of violence, *see United States v. Dominguez*, 954 F.3d 1251, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 2020), and aiding and abetting a crime of violence is also a crime of violence, *see Young*, 22 F.4th at 1122–23, we affirm the district courts' denials of defendants-appellants' § 2255 motions.

AFFIRMED.

*** The Honorable Sidney A. Fitzwater, United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, sitting by designation.