

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

No. 18-10504
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

July 30, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

JIMMIE BERNARD WALKER,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:01-CR-40-1

Before JOLLY, JONES, and OLDHAM, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Jimmie Bernard Walker appeals a special condition of supervised release that was imposed following the revocation of his supervised release. The district court did not plainly err in prohibiting Walker from having “any form of unsupervised contact with minors under the age of 18 at any location, including but not limited to, the defendant’s residence, place of employment, and public places where minors frequent or congregate, without prior

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 18-10504

permission of the probation officer.” *See United States v. Fields*, 777 F.3d 799, 802-07 (5th Cir. 2015).

Walker was previously convicted of sexually assaulting three young children, and he violated several of the conditions of his supervised release, including the condition that he register as a sex offender, shortly after he was released from prison. *See United States v. Caravayo*, 809 F.3d 269, 275-76, (5th Cir. 2015). The unsupervised contact condition is therefore reasonably related to the nature and characteristics of one of Walker’s supervised release violations and his history and characteristics, the need to deter criminal conduct, and the need to protect the public from his further crimes. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(d)(1). The condition does not impose a greater deprivation of liberty than is reasonably necessary to deter Walker and to protect the public. *See* § 3583(d)(2). In addition, Walker fails to show that the court committed clear or obvious error in explaining the reasons for the condition. *See United States v. Mondragon-Santiago*, 564 F.3d 357, 361-65 (5th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.