

## **APPENDIX**

Judgment of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals 3-19-2018 .....	1
Order Denying Petition for Rehearing 5-22-2018 .....	2
Order Regarding U.S.C. § 2255 Motion 9-15-2017.....	3

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

---

No: 17-3484

---

Anthony Curtis Flowers

Petitioner - Appellant

v.

United States of America

Respondent - Appellee

---

Appeal from U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Iowa - Cedar Rapids  
(1:16-cv-00106-LRR)

---

**JUDGMENT**

Before GRUENDER, BOWMAN and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

This appeal comes before the court on appellant's application for a certificate of appealability. The court has carefully reviewed the original file of the district court, and the application for a certificate of appealability is denied. The appeal is dismissed.

March 19, 2018

Order Entered at the Direction of the Court:  
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit.

---

/s/ Michael E. Gans

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No: 17-3484

Anthony Curtis Flowers

Appellant

v.

United States of America

Appellee

---

Appeal from U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Iowa - Cedar Rapids  
(1:16-cv-00106-LRR)

---

**ORDER**

The petition for rehearing by the panel is denied.

May 22, 2018

Order Entered at the Direction of the Court:  
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit.

---

/s/ Michael E. Gans

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA  
CEDAR RAPIDS DIVISION

ANTHONY C. FLOWERS,

Movant,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

No. C16-0106-LRR  
No. CR00-0055-LRR

ORDER REGARDING  
28 U.S.C. § 2255 MOTION

This matter appears before the court on the movant's motion to vacate, set aside or correct sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (civil docket no. 1). The movant filed such motion on May 25, 2016. In his § 2255 motion, the movant claims that he is entitled to relief under the recent United States Supreme Court decision in *Johnson v. United States*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (2015). Given the parties' plea agreement, the validity of the movant's convictions in the instant case, the movant's criminal history and the sentencing record, the court finds that it is appropriate to apply the concurrent sentence doctrine, which applies if not all concurrent sentences are attacked and success on the claim at issue does not call into question the overall term of imprisonment. *See United States v. Olunloyo*, 10 F.3d 578, 581 (8th Cir. 1993); *United States v. Smith*, 601 F.2d 972, 973-74 (8th Cir. 1979); *United States v. Martinez*, 573 F.2d 529, 532 (8th Cir. 1978); *see also Sun Bear v. United States*, 644 F.3d 700, 705 (8th Cir. 2011) (en banc) (explaining that movant already had been afforded fair procedure and it is a "basic principle that, in sentencing, a miscarriage of justice cognizable under § 2255 occurs when the sentence is in excess of that authorized by law" (citing *United States v. Addonizio*, 442 U.S. 178, 184 (1979))); *Olten v. United States*, 565 F. App'x 558, 561 (8th Cir. 2014),

*cert. denied*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 135 S. Ct. 1893 (2015) (concluding that relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is inappropriate where the same sentence “could be reimposed were [the movant] granted the § 2255 relief he requests.”).<sup>1</sup> At this point, the validity of the movant’s enhanced sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3559(c) is not in question and any possible relief he might someday obtain on such conviction is too speculative, and, thus, it is highly unlikely that he would be substantially prejudiced or exposed to a substantial risk of adverse collateral consequences if the court does not address the merits of his concurrent sentence of life imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. § 924(e). Because it is appropriate to decline to address the validity of the movant’s concurrent sentence under count 6 in light of the record, the movant’s motion to vacate, set aside or correct sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (civil docket no. 1) is denied. Additionally, a certificate of appealability will not issue. *See generally* 28 U.S.C. § 2253.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 15th day of September, 2017.



LINDA R. READE, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA

---

<sup>1</sup> The court notes that the movant is unable to advance non-Armed Career Criminal Act claims as a result of procedural obstacles. *Cf. Raybon v. United States*, No. 16-2522, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 15029, 2017 WL 3470389, at \*2-3 (6th Cir. Aug. 14, 2017) (concluding movant could not rely on statute of limitation as set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f)(3) because *Johnson* did not recognize a new “Constitutional right not to be sentenced as a career offender under the residual clause of the mandatory Sentencing Guidelines”).