

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

No. 17-40653
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

July 30, 2018

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

JERRY W. WILLIAMS,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Texas
USDC No. 1:00-CR-53-1

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, ELROD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Following a 2001 jury trial, Jerry W. Williams was convicted of 14 counts of making a false statement and sentenced to serve six months in prison and a two-year term of supervised release and to pay restitution, a fine, and an assessment. Now, we consider his challenge to the district court's denial of his motion to unseal records, to reconsider his restitution and fine, and to order

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

No. 17-40653

that his name be removed from the Credit Alert Verification and Reporting System.

Insofar as Williams attempts to challenge other judgments or orders in this action, we will not consider these challenges due to lack of timely notices of appeal. *See Manrique v. United States*, 137 S. Ct. 1266, 1271-72 (2017). *United States v. Pesina-Rodriguez*, 825 F.3d 787, 788 (5th Cir. 2016); *United States v. Hernandez-Gomez*, 795 F.3d 510, 511 (5th Cir. 2015). Williams's appeal is thus DISMISSED to the extent he seeks to challenge judgments or orders other than the district court's denial of his motion to unseal records, to reconsider his restitution and fine, and to order that his name be removed from the Credit Alert Verification and Reporting System. Additionally, the Government's motion to dismiss is GRANTED insofar as it seeks dismissal of the appeal of these orders and judgments.

Williams fails to address the reasoning underlying the order that is properly before us in this appeal, which puts him in the same position as if he had not appealed the judgment at all. *Brinkmann v. Dallas Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the district court's denial of his motion to unseal and to reconsider his fine and restitution is AFFIRMED. The Government's motion for summary affirmance or an extension of time to file a brief is DENIED.