NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

NOV 3 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff - Appellee, v. BISRAT DEMISSIE, Defendant - Appellant.	No. 26-1645 D.C. No. 2:25-cr-00095-TL-1 MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Washington
Tana Lin, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 27, 2026**

Before: SILVERMAN, FORREST, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Bisrat Demissie appeals from the district court's judgment revoking supervised release and challenges the one-year term of supervised release imposed to follow his six-month term of imprisonment, as well as a special condition. 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).

Demissie contends that the one-year term of supervision is substantively unreasonable because social science evidence shows that prolonged supervision can be counterproductive and because federal supervision complicates his ability to resolve a pending state charge. The district court considered these arguments and explained why it was not persuaded by them. It did not abuse its discretion in concluding that an additional year of supervision was warranted to protect the public and to provide Demissie necessary rehabilitative support. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e); *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 51 (2007).

Demissie next challenges the district court's addition of a special condition prohibiting alcohol use, arguing that the condition is overbroad and substantively unreasonable because he has no history of alcohol abuse and because alcohol played no role in his violations or criminal offenses. We review this claim for plain error. *See United States v. Sales*, 476 F.3d 732, 735 (9th Cir. 2007). Given Demissie's history with controlled substances, including the violations at issue here, the district court did not plainly err in imposing the alcohol abstention condition. *See* U.S.S.G. § 5B1.3(d)(4)(B); *Sales*, 476 F.3d at 735-36; *see also United States v. Vega,* 545 F.3d 743, 747-48 (9th Cir. 2008) (discussing the tie between alcohol and drug abuse and the reasonableness of prohibiting both as part of an "integrated rehabilitative scheme" (internal quotation marks omitted)).

AFFIRMED.