

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 26-10646
CONSOLIDATED WITH
No. 26-10673

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

August 27, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

JOSHUA ROBERT LINK,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC Nos. 4:26-CR-51-2, 4:26-CR-60-2

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

PER CURIAM:*

Joshua Robert Link and five others are charged with conspiracy to commit wire fraud, 10 counts of wire fraud, and two counts of money laundering. In a related case, Link and his brother, Jason Link, are charged with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and two counts of wire fraud.¹ Link

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

¹ Jason Link is also charged with two counts of money laundering.

26-10646
c/w No. 26-10673

appeals from the district court's order denying his motion for revocation of the district court's pretrial detention order and alternatively for temporary release under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i).

“Absent an error of law,” we will uphold a district court's pretrial detention order “if it is supported by the proceedings below, a deferential standard of review that we equate to the abuse-of-discretion standard.” *United States v. Rueben*, 974 F.2d 580, 586 (5th Cir. 1992) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). We conclude that the evidence as a whole supports the district court's conclusion that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure Link's appearance at future court proceedings, based on the nature and circumstances of the offenses charged, Link's history and characteristics, and Link's actual flight out of the United States after he learned of the evidence against him. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g). Further, Link has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in denying his alternative request for temporary release to prepare for trial under § 3142(i). *See Rueben*, 974 F.2d at 586.

Accordingly, the district court's order is AFFIRMED.