

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 4 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ERIC ROBIN LENOROVITZ,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 25-7024

D.C. No.

2:24-cr-00028-RSL-1

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Robert S. Lasnik, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 29, 2026**

Before: McKEOWN, TALLMAN, and MENDOZA, JR., Circuit Judges.

Eric Robin Lenorovitz appeals from the district court's judgment and challenges the \$4,000 restitution order imposed following his guilty-plea conviction for possession of child pornography in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2252(a)(4)(B). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

* 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).

Lenorovitz does not dispute that the court properly awarded the mandatory minimum of \$3,000 under § 2259(b)(2)(B). He contends, however, that the district court erred in awarding an additional \$1,000 in attorneys' fees. Though the statute permits recovery of attorneys' fees, *see* 18 U.S.C. § 2259(c)(2)(E), he argues that the court erred by failing to disaggregate the damage done by the original abuser and failing to ensure that the victim had not been fully compensated from other sources. We review the legality of a restitution order *de novo*, and the amount of restitution for abuse of discretion. *See United States v. Galan*, 804 F.3d 1287, 1289 (9th Cir. 2015).

Lenorovitz's arguments are misplaced. The district court found that the mandatory award of \$3,000 was "definitely appropriate here," and the record supported "another \$1,000 in attorneys' fees." This record reflects that the court attributed the mandatory award to Lenorovitz's role in continuing the trafficking of images of the victim, *see Paroline v. United States*, 572 U.S. 434, 460 (2014), separate from the attorneys' fees associated with this case. Moreover, the record demonstrates that the victim's attorney incurred at least \$1,000 in fees for her work on Lenorovitz's case; in a letter provided to the district court, the victim's attorney specified the work she had done "directly on this case," as well as the total number of hours she anticipated spending on this case and her hourly rate. Lastly, the record showed that the losses to the victim were ongoing and had not been fully

compensated. On this record, the restitution order is within statutory bounds, and the district court did not abuse its discretion in awarding \$4,000. *See id.* at 459 (determining the amount of restitution “cannot be a precise mathematical inquiry and involves the use of discretion and sound judgment”).

AFFIRMED.