[NOT FOR PUBLICATION - NOT TO BE CITED AS PRECEDENT]

United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

No. 01-2071

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Appellee,

v.

DAVID J. OAKES, Defendant, Appellant.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE

[Hon. Gene Carter, <u>U.S. District Judge</u>]

Before

Selya, Circuit Judge,

Gibson* and Greenberg, ** Senior Circuit Judges.

Douglas J. Beaton for appellant.

<u>F. Mark Terison</u>, Senior Litigation Counsel, with whom <u>Paula D.</u> <u>Silsby</u>, United States Attorney, was on brief, for appellee.

October 4, 2002

^{*}Of the Eighth Circuit, sitting by designation. **Of the Third Circuit, sitting by designation.

Per Curiam. This sentencing appeal poses a legal question that is materially indistinguishable from that which we recently answered in <u>United States</u> v. <u>Ahlers</u>, Nos. 01-2570, 01-2571 (1st Cir. Sept. 30, 2002). Based on the holding in <u>Ahlers</u>, Oakes's suggested answer to that question must be rejected. Here, moreover, unlike in <u>Ahlers</u>, the district court affirmatively found that the facts did not support the departure request. Thus, even apart from <u>Ahlers</u>, the sentence in this case would be unreviewable. <u>See United States</u> v. <u>Pierro</u>, 32 F.3d 611, 619 (1st Cir. 1994); <u>United States</u> v. <u>Hilton</u>, 946 F.2d 955, 957 (1st Cir. 1991). For both of these reasons, Oakes's appeal fails.

Affirmed.