

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

July 15, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 07-30913  
Summary Calendar  
\_\_\_\_\_

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

MICHAEL LINES, also known as Michael Jerome Lines

Defendant-Appellant

---

consol. w/ No. 07-30926

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

MICHAEL LINES

Defendant-Appellant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Louisiana  
USDC No. 5:06-CR-50142-ALL  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before STEWART, OWEN, and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Michael Lines appeals the 240-month non-guidelines sentence imposed following his guilty plea conviction for attempted sexual exploitation of children and possession of child pornography. Lines argues that his non-guidelines sentence is unreasonable because the district court improperly considered certain factors. He contends that a guidelines sentence would have been sufficient to meet the sentencing objectives of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

The district court noted the seriousness of the offense and described how Lines attempted to entice a child to Missouri to engage in sexual activity, traveled to Louisiana with the intent to engage in sexual behavior with a child and create child pornography, and possessed numerous images of child pornography. The images were extremely graphic in nature. The court stated that a non-guidelines sentence was needed for adequate deterrence and to protect the public from Lines. Additionally, the court focused on the character of the defendant, concluding that Lines was a predator. Thus, the record reflects that the district court did not abuse its discretion in sentencing Lines because it properly considered the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors and provided sufficiently detailed reasons for arriving at the sentence imposed. See *Gall v. United States*, 128 S. Ct. 586, 596-97 (2007); *United States v. Williams*, 517 F.3d 801, 808-09 (5th Cir. 2008). Further, the extent of the variance was not unreasonable given the evidence before the district court. See *United States v. Simkanin*, 420 F.3d 397, 419 (5th Cir. 2005).

Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is **AFFIRMED**.

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.