

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 26 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MAZIAR REZAKHANI,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 26-860

D.C. No.

2:15-cr-00395-JLR-1

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
James L. Robart, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 25, 2026**

Before: SILVERMAN, N.R. SMITH, and DE ALBA, Circuit Judges.

Maziar Rezakhani appeals from the district court's judgment revoking his supervised release. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we affirm.

Rezakhani contends that the district court erred by admitting documentary

* 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). Rezakhani's motion to waive oral argument is therefore granted.

hearsay evidence without any showing by the government that the witnesses were unavailable and without weighing his interest in confronting the witnesses. As Rezakhani concedes, we review this claim for plain error. *See United States v. Rusnak*, 981 F.3d 697, 707 (9th Cir. 2020).

Although the government informed Rezakhani before the revocation hearing, and again at the hearing, that it intended to rely solely on documentary evidence, he did not object. Instead, he called two of his own witnesses. The district court found, and the record shows, that neither witness effectively rebutted the documentary evidence, which included police records detailing the indicia of falsification in the evidence Rezakhani submitted in the state proceedings. On this record, we decline to grant relief because any error did not “seriously affect[] the fairness, integrity, or public reputation of [the revocation] proceedings.” *United States v. Dallman*, 533 F.3d 755, 761 (9th Cir. 2008) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Rezakhani also contends that the evidence was insufficient to support the district court’s finding that he violated state law by tampering with physical evidence, thereby violating the terms of his supervised release. Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the government, however, any rational trier of fact could have found the violation by a preponderance of the evidence. *See United States v. King*, 608 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2010).

The government's motion to supplement the record on appeal is denied.

AFFIRMED.