

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 25-10685
Non-Argument Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

CALEB ROBERT WIEN,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 2:23-cr-00109-SPC-NPM-1

Before NEWSOM, BRANCH, and WILSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Defendant-Appellant Caleb Wien appeals the district court's order of a total of \$25,000 in restitution to three victims of child pornography, imposed as part of his sentence for possessing and

accessing with intent to view prepubescent child pornography. He first argues that he had a constitutional right under the Fifth and Sixth Amendments to have a jury make fact findings regarding the amount of restitution he owed. Second, he argues that the district court was required to disaggregate victims' total losses from the losses caused by their initial abusers when calculating restitution. After careful review, we affirm.

I.

We review "the legality of a restitution order" *de novo*. *United States v. Kluge*, 147 F.4th 1291, 1296 (11th Cir. 2025).

Defendants convicted of sexual exploitation of children offenses are required to pay restitution. 18 U.S.C. § 2259(a), (b)(4)(A). For convictions of trafficking in child pornography, "[t]he court shall determine the full amount of the victim's losses that were incurred or are reasonably projected to be incurred by the victim as a result of the trafficking in child pornography depicting the victim," and then "order restitution in an amount that reflects the defendant's relative role in the causal process that underlies the victim's losses, but which is no less than \$3,000." *Id.* § 2259(b)(2)(A)-(B). "A victim's total aggregate recovery . . . shall not exceed the full amount of the victim's demonstrated losses." *Id.* § 2259(b)(2)(C).

A proper restitution amount "comports with the defendant's relative role in the causal process that underlies the victim's general losses." *Paroline v. United States*, 572 U.S. 434, 458 (2014). The government must prove the amount by a preponderance of

25-10685

Opinion of the Court

3

the evidence, but a district court can accept a “reasonable estimate of the loss.” *United States v. Rothenberg*, 923 F.3d 1309, 1337 (11th Cir. 2019) (quotation marks omitted)).

In *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, the Supreme Court held that, other than the fact of a prior conviction, any fact that increases the penalty for a crime beyond the prescribed statutory maximum must be submitted to a jury and proved beyond a reasonable doubt. 530 U.S. 466, 490 (2000). In *Alleyne v. United States*, the Supreme Court extended the rule in *Apprendi* by requiring that all facts that increase mandatory minimum sentences must be submitted to the jury as well. 570 U.S. 99, 117 (2013).

In *Dohrmann v. United States*, we held that *Apprendi* does not apply to restitution orders because the restitution statute does not have a prescribed statutory maximum. 442 F.3d 1279, 1281 (11th Cir. 2006). Then, in *Southern Union Co. v. United States*, the Supreme Court held that *Apprendi* applies to criminal fines. 567 U.S. 343, 353, 360 (2012). But in *Gatlin v. United States*, considering a challenge to a restitution order under § 3663A, we rejected an argument that *Southern Union* abrogated *Dohrmann* because we had not determined that restitution, like a criminal fine, is a criminal penalty and *Southern Union* did not discuss restitution, let alone hold that *Apprendi* should apply to restitution orders. 90 F.4th 1050, 1074 (11th Cir. 2024).

More recently, in *Kluge*, we rejected the appellant’s argument that a restitution award under 18 U.S.C. § 2259 required a jury, rather than a judge, to make the essential findings required to

trigger the mandatory minimum of \$3,000. 147 F.4th at 1301–02. We reiterated that our precedent, *Dohrmann* and *Gatlin*, foreclosed the arguments that *Apprendi* and *Alleyne* apply to restitution orders under § 2259. *Id.*

Here, as Wien concedes, our binding precedent forecloses his argument that the district court violated his Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights by ordering him to pay a total of \$25,000 in restitution to three identified victims without requiring findings by a jury, or a finding that Wien otherwise admitted to the facts supporting the restitution award when pleading guilty.¹ Accordingly, we affirm as to this issue.

II.

In *Rothenberg*, after careful review of *Paroline*, we determined that a district court is not required to “determine, calculate, or disaggregate” the victim’s losses caused by the original creator or other distributors before determining the losses caused by the defendant. 923 F.3d at 1333. It is sufficient for the district court to say that it has considered that a defendant is only a possessor and that the restitution award is based solely on that conduct. *Id.* at 1334.

¹ Under the prior panel precedent rule, our prior decisions are binding until they are overruled by this court sitting en banc, by the Supreme Court, or if the Supreme Court has “undermined [the decision] to the point of abrogation.” *United States v. Sneed*, 600 F.3d 1326, 1332 (11th Cir. 2010).

25-10685

Opinion of the Court

5

Here, as Wien concedes, our binding precedent forecloses his argument that the district court needed to disaggregate the victims' losses caused by the initial abuse from the losses he caused before awarding restitution. Because *Rothenberg* has not been overruled or abrogated, we are bound to apply it. Accordingly, we affirm as to this issue.

AFFIRMED.

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

ELBERT PARR TUTTLE COURT OF APPEALS BUILDING
56 Forsyth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

David J. Smith
Clerk of Court

For rules and forms visit
www.ca11.uscourts.gov

May 11, 2026

MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES

Appeal Number: 25-10685-EE
Case Style: USA v. Caleb Wien
District Court Docket No: 2:23-cr-00109-SPC-NPM-1

Opinion Issued

Enclosed is a copy of the Court's decision issued today in this case. Judgment has been entered today pursuant to FRAP 36. The Court's mandate will issue at a later date pursuant to FRAP 41(b).

Petitions for Rehearing

The time for filing a petition for panel rehearing or rehearing en banc is governed by 11th Cir. R. 40-2. Please see FRAP 40 and the accompanying circuit rules for information concerning petitions for rehearing.

Costs

No costs are taxed.

Bill of Costs

If costs are taxed, please use the most recent version of the Bill of Costs form available on the Court's website at www.ca11.uscourts.gov. For more information regarding costs, see FRAP 39 and 11th Cir. R. 39-1.

Attorney's Fees

The time to file and required documentation for an application for attorney's fees and any objection to the application are governed by 11th Cir. R. 39-2 and 39-3.

Appointed Counsel

Counsel appointed under the Criminal Justice Act (CJA) must submit a voucher claiming compensation via the eVoucher system no later than 45 days after issuance of the mandate or the filing of a petition for writ of certiorari. Please contact the CJA Team at (404) 335-6167 or cja_evoucher@ca11.uscourts.gov for questions regarding CJA vouchers or the eVoucher system.

Clerk's Office Phone Numbers

General Information:	404-335-6100	Attorney Admissions:	404-335-6122
Case Administration:	404-335-6135	Capital Cases:	404-335-6200
CM/ECF Help Desk:	404-335-6125	Cases Set for Oral Argument:	404-335-6141

OPIN-1 Ntc of Issuance of Opinion