

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-30576
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

September 2, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

HIKMAT DEEB,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Louisiana
USDC No. 5:23-CR-214-2

Before HAYNES, GRAVES, and RAMIREZ, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Hikmat Deeb appeals the sentence imposed following his guilty plea conviction of money laundering. He raises four arguments: (1) the Government breached the plea agreement by failing to move for a one-level reduction under U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1(b); (2) the district court erroneously applied a four-level enhancement to his base offense level under U.S.S.G. § 3B1.1(a); (3) the district court erred in calculating his criminal history

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

No. 25-30576

score; and (4) his within-guidelines sentence of 244 months of imprisonment is substantively unreasonable.

As for his first argument, Deeb fails to show that the alleged breach of the plea agreement affected his substantial rights. *See Puckett v. United States*, 556 U.S. 129, 135 (2009); *United States v. Malmquist*, 92 F.4th 555, 563-64 (5th Cir. 2024). Furthermore, the district court did not clearly err in finding that the § 3B1.1(a) leadership enhancement applied because the district court's treatment of couriers who transported money as participants in the money laundering operation was plausible in light of the record as a whole. *See United States v. Ochoa-Gomez*, 777 F.3d 278, 281 (5th Cir. 2015); *United States v. Glinsey*, 209 F.3d 386, 396 (5th Cir. 2000). Deeb fails to show that any error in his criminal history score affected his substantial rights. *See Puckett*, 556 U.S. at 135. Lastly, his substantive reasonableness argument is unavailing because he fails to show that “the sentence does not account for a factor that should receive significant weight, it gives significant weight to an irrelevant or improper factor, or it represents a clear error of judgment in balancing sentencing factors.” *United States v. Cooks*, 589 F.3d 173, 186 (5th Cir. 2009); *see also United States v. Rider*, 94 F.4th 445, 461 (5th Cir. 2024); *United States v. Waguespack*, 935 F.3d 322, 337 (5th Cir. 2019).

AFFIRMED.