United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-30214 Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

December 23, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

United States of America,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

Sharhonda Law,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana USDC No. 5:24-CR-34-1

Before KING, HAYNES, and Ho, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Sharhonda Law appeals the 20-month sentence imposed following her guilty plea conviction for aiding and assisting in making and subscribing a false return. She challenges the application of the two-level enhancement for obstruction of justice pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 3C1.1. Law asserts that the district court failed to make adequate findings to support the application of

* This opinion is not designated for publication. See 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 25-30214

the § 3C1.1 enhancement. She also contends that the Government did not "establish the essential elements of willful intent and materiality."

We review the district court's factual findings, including a finding of obstruction of justice, for clear error and its interpretation or application of the Sentencing Guidelines de novo. *United States v. Perryman*, 965 F.3d 424, 426 (5th Cir. 2020). However, unpreserved arguments are reviewed for plain error only. *Id.* at 427.

Section 3C1.1 provides for a two-level enhancement if the defendant "willfully obstructed or impeded, or attempted to obstruct or impede, the administration of justice with respect to the investigation, prosecution, or sentencing of the instant offense of conviction" where the "obstructive conduct related to . . . the defendant's offense of conviction and any relevant conduct" or "a closely related offense[.]" U.S.S.G. § 3C1.1. The commentary to § 3C1.1 specifically provides that such conduct includes "providing materially false information to a probation officer in respect to a presentence or other investigation for the court." U.S.S.G. § 3C1.1, comment. (n.4(H)).

Law has shown no error, much less plain error, with respect to the district court's findings supporting the application of the § 3C1.1 enhancement and its application of the enhancement. *See Perryman*, 965 F.3d at 426-27.

AFFIRMED.