

No. 19-6658

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BOOKER TERRY SIMMONS, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

NOEL J. FRANCISCO
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov
(202) 514-2217

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 19-6658

BOOKER TERRY SIMMONS, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

Petitioner contends (Pet. 8-29) that the court of appeals erred in denying a certificate of appealability on his claim, which he brought in a motion under 28 U.S.C. 2255, that the residual clause in Section 4B1.2(a) (1998) of the previously binding federal Sentencing Guidelines is void for vagueness under Johnson v. United States, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (2015). For reasons similar to those explained on pages 9 to 16 of the government's brief in opposition to the petition for a writ of certiorari in Gipson v. United States, No. 17-8637 (filed July 25, 2018), cert. denied, 139 S. Ct. 373 (2018), that contention does not warrant this Court's

review.¹ This Court has recently and repeatedly denied review of other petitions presenting similar issues. See, e.g., Blackstone v. United States, 139 S. Ct. 2762 (2019) (No. 18-9368); Green v. United States, 139 S. Ct. 1590 (2019) (No. 18-8435); Cannady v. United States, 139 S. Ct. 1355 (2019) (No. 18-7783); Sterling v. United States, 139 S. Ct. 1277 (2019) (No. 18-7453); Allen v. United States, 139 S. Ct. 1231 (2019) (No. 18-7421); Bright v. United States, 139 S. Ct. 1204 (2019) (No. 18-7132); Whisby v. United States, 139 S. Ct. 940 (2019) (No. 18-6375); Jordan v. United States, 139 S. Ct. 653 (2018) (No. 18-6599). The same result is warranted here.²

¹ We have served petitioner with a copy of the government's brief in opposition in Gipson.

² Other pending petitions have raised similar issues. See Gadsden v. United States, No. 18-9506 (filed Apr. 18, 2019); Pullen v. United States, No. 19-5219 (filed July 15, 2019); Bronson v. United States, No. 19-5316 (filed July 19, 2019); Brigman v. United States, No. 19-5307 (filed July 22, 2019); Aguilar v. United States, No. 19-5315 (filed July 22, 2019); Hemby v. United States, No. 19-6054 (filed Sept. 18, 2019); Jennings v. United States, No. 19-6336 (filed Oct. 17, 2019); Holz v. United States, No. 19-6379 (filed Oct. 21, 2019); Autrey v. United States, No. 19-6492 (filed Nov. 1, 2019); Douglas v. United States, No. 19-6510 (filed Nov. 4, 2019); Simmons v. United States, No. 19-6521 (filed Nov. 4, 2019); Hirano v. United States, No. 19-6652 (filed Nov. 12, 2019); Bridge v. United States, No. 19-6670 (filed Nov. 14, 2019); Hunter v. United States, No. 19-6686 (filed Nov. 14, 2019); Fernandez v. United States, No. 19-6689 (filed Nov. 14, 2019); Garcia-Cruz v. United States, No. 19-6755 (filed Nov. 19, 2019); Lackey v. United States, No. 19-6759 (filed Nov. 20, 2019); Hicks v. United States, No. 19-6769 (filed Nov. 20, 2019); London v. United States, No. 19-6785 (filed Nov. 25, 2019); Lacy v. United States, No. 19-6832 (filed Nov. 25, 2019); Ward v. United States, No. 19-6818 (filed Nov. 27, 2019).

Petitioner's motion under 28 U.S.C. 2255 was not timely, because petitioner filed the motion more than one year after his conviction became final and because this Court's decision in Johnson did not recognize a new retroactive right with respect to the formerly binding Sentencing Guidelines that would provide petitioner with a new window for filing his claim. See 28 U.S.C. 2255(f)(1) and (3); Br. in Opp. at 9-14, Gipson, supra (No. 17-8637). Nearly every court of appeals to address the issue -- including the court below -- has determined that a defendant like petitioner is not entitled to collaterally attack his sentence based on Johnson. See United States v. London, 937 F.3d 502, 507-508 (5th Cir. 2019) (holding that a challenge to the residual clause of the formerly binding career-offender guideline was untimely under Section 2255(f)(3)), petition for cert. pending, No. 19-6785 (filed Nov. 25, 2019); United States v. Blackstone, 903 F.3d 1020, 1026-1028 (9th Cir. 2018) (same), cert. denied, 139 S. Ct. 2762 (2019); Russo v. United States, 902 F.3d 880, 883-884 (8th Cir. 2018) (same), cert. denied, 139 S. Ct. 1297 (2019); United States v. Green, 898 F.3d 315, 322-323 (3d Cir. 2018) (same), cert. denied, 139 S. Ct. 1590 (2019); United States v. Greer, 881 F.3d 1241, 1248-1249 (10th Cir.), cert. denied, 139 S. Ct. 374 (2018); United States v. Brown, 868 F.3d 297, 303 (4th Cir. 2017), cert. denied, 139 S. Ct. 14 (2018); Raybon v. United States, 867 F.3d 625, 629-630 (6th Cir. 2017), cert. denied, 138 S. Ct. 2661 (2018); see also Upshaw v. United States, 739 Fed.

Appx. 538, 540-541 (11th Cir. 2018) (per curiam), cert. denied, 139 S. Ct. 841 (2019). Only the Seventh Circuit has concluded otherwise. See Cross v. United States, 892 F.3d 288, 293-294, 299-307 (2018). But that shallow conflict -- on an issue as to which few claimants would be entitled to relief on the merits, see Br. in Opp. at 16, Gipson, supra (No. 17-8637); pp. 4-5, infra -- does not warrant this Court's review, and this Court has previously declined to review it. See p. 2, supra.

In any event, this case would be an unsuitable vehicle for addressing the question presented because even if the challenged language in the Sentencing Guidelines were deemed unconstitutionally vague in some applications, it was not vague as applied to petitioner. Petitioner was convicted of conspiracy to commit bank robbery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 371, and aiding and abetting bank robbery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 2113(d) and 2, and at the time of his sentencing, he had prior convictions in California for robbery and possession of cocaine for sale. Judgment 1; see Presentence Investigation Report ¶¶ 1-7, 90. In the 1998 Sentencing Guidelines under which petitioner was sentenced, a defendant would be a career offender if, inter alia, "the instant offense of conviction is a felony that is either a crime of violence or a controlled substance offense" and "the defendant has at least two prior felony convictions of either a crime of violence or a controlled substance offense." Sentencing Guidelines § 4B1.1 (1998). The classification of petitioner's

cocaine conviction as a "controlled substance offense" did not involve the Guideline's residual clause, and the official commentary to Section 4B1.2 expressly stated that a "[c]rime of violence" includes * * * robbery," as well as related aiding and abetting and conspiracy crimes. Sentencing Guidelines § 4B1.2, comment. (n.1) (1998). The Guideline therefore provided sufficient notice, irrespective of the residual clause language, that petitioner's conspiracy to commit bank robbery, aiding and abetting bank robbery, and California robbery crimes were covered, precluding any claim of vagueness as applied to him. See Br. in Opp. at 17-18, Gipson, supra (No. 17-8637).

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.³

Respectfully submitted.

NOEL J. FRANCISCO
Solicitor General

DECEMBER 2019

³ The government waives any further response to the petition unless this Court requests otherwise.