

judge to explicitly state his reasons for applying particular Guidelines, and sentencing within the recommended Guidelines range, or in the alternative, for choosing to sentence outside that range. Such a statement will facilitate appellate review as to whether the sentence was ‘reasonable.’” *United States v. Jones*, 399 F.3d 640, 650 (6th Cir. 2005); *see also Booker*, 125 S.Ct. at 765 (noting that appellate review of a district court sentence is for reasonableness); *United States v. Webb*, — F.3d —, 2005 WL 763367 (6th Cir. 2005) (engaging in reasonableness review, but refusing to “define rigidly at this time either the meaning of reasonableness or the procedures that a district judge must employ in sentencing post-*Booker*”).

Accordingly, we **VACATE** the sentence and **REMAND** for proceedings consistent with this opinion.