

APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix Page

Unpublished Opinion of The United States Court of Appeals For The Fourth Circuit entered September 16, 2019	1a
Judgment of The United States Court of Appeals For The Fourth Circuit entered September 16, 2019	4a
18 U.S.C. § 3553.....	5a

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-4884

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MICHAEL EUGENE SPRY,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. James C. Dever III, District Judge. (2:16-cr-00013-D-1)

Submitted: August 30, 2019

Decided: September 16, 2019

Before NIEMEYER, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jennifer Haynes Rose, LAW OFFICE OF JENNIFER HAYNES ROSE, Cary, North Carolina, for Appellant. Robert J. Higdon, Jr., United States Attorney, Jennifer P. May-Parker, Assistant United States Attorney, Kristine L. Fritz, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Eugene Spry appeals his 36-month sentence imposed following the revocation of supervised release. Spry admitted that he violated the conditions of supervised release because he committed criminal conduct, failed to report to the probation officer, and absconded from supervision. Spry contends that his sentence is unreasonable and also violates the Double Jeopardy Clause. We affirm.

“[A] court of appeals reviewing a district court’s revocation sentence must adopt a more deferential appellate posture than when reviewing original sentences to account for the unique nature of supervised release revocation sentences.” *United States v. Gibbs*, 897 F.3d 199, 203 (4th Cir. 2018) (brackets and internal quotation marks omitted). “We will not disturb a district court’s revocation sentence unless it falls outside the statutory maximum or is otherwise plainly unreasonable.” *United States v. Padgett*, 788 F.3d 370, 373 (4th Cir. 2015) (internal quotation marks omitted).

As with original sentences, we review the procedural and substantive reasonableness of the revocation sentence. *Gibbs*, 897 F.3d at 204.

A revocation sentence passes procedural muster if it is supported by a sufficient explanation so that we may effectively review the reasonableness of the sentence, which must encompass an assurance that the sentencing court considered the applicable sentencing factors with regard to the particular defendant before it and also considered any potentially meritorious arguments raised by the parties with regard to sentencing. And a sentence passes substantive muster if the totality of the circumstances indicates that the court had a proper basis for its conclusion that the defendant should receive the sentence imposed.

Id. (brackets, citations, and internal quotation marks omitted). “Only if a revocation sentence is unreasonable must we assess whether it is plainly so.” *Padgett*, 788 F.3d at

373. “The sentencing court must consider both the policy statements and the applicable policy statement range . . . as well as the applicable 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors.” *Id.* (brackets and internal quotation marks omitted).

After reviewing the record and the transcript of the revocation hearing, we conclude that Spry’s sentence is not unreasonable. The district court provided a sufficient explanation for its findings and adequately analyzed the applicable § 3553(a) factors. Furthermore, we conclude that the district court articulated a proper basis for its conclusion that Spry should be sentenced to the statutory maximum.

Spry’s double jeopardy argument is without merit. The Supreme Court recently upheld the dual sovereignty exception to the Double Jeopardy Clause. *Gamble v. United States*, 139 S. Ct. 1960, 1964-67 (2019).

Accordingly, we affirm Spry’s sentence. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

FILED: September 16, 2019

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-4884
(2:16-cr-00013-D-1)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

MICHAEL EUGENE SPRY

Defendant - Appellant

J U D G M E N T

In accordance with the decision of this court, the judgment of the district court is affirmed.

This judgment shall take effect upon issuance of this court's mandate in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 41.

/s/ PATRICIA S. CONNOR, CLERK

Title 18 United States Code, Section 3553:

(a)FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN IMPOSING A SENTENCE.—The court shall impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) of this subsection. The court, in determining the particular sentence to be imposed, shall consider—

(1)

the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant;

(2)the need for the sentence imposed—

(A)

to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense;

(B)

to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct;

(C)

to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and

(D)

to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner;

(3)

the kinds of sentences available;

(4)the kinds of sentence and the sentencing range established for—

(A)the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of defendant as set forth in the guidelines—

(i)

issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to [section 994\(a\)\(1\) of title 28](#), United States Code, subject to any amendments made to such guidelines by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under [section 994\(p\) of title 28](#)); and

(ii)

that, except as provided in [section 3742\(g\)](#), are in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced; or

(B)

in the case of a violation of probation or supervised release, the applicable guidelines or policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to [section 994\(a\)\(3\) of title 28](#), United States Code, taking into account any amendments made to such guidelines or policy statements by act of Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under [section 994\(p\) of title 28](#));

(5)any pertinent policy statement—

(A)

issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to [section 994\(a\)\(2\) of title 28](#), United States Code, subject to any amendments made to such policy statement by act of

Congress (regardless of whether such amendments have yet to be incorporated by the Sentencing Commission into amendments issued under [section 994\(p\) of title 28](#)); and

(B)

that, except as provided in section 3742(g), is in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced.^[1]

(6)

the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct; and

(7)

the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense.

(b) APPLICATION OF GUIDELINES IN IMPOSING A SENTENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

Except as provided in paragraph (2), the court shall impose a sentence of the kind, and within the range, referred to in subsection (a)(4) unless the court finds that there exists an aggravating or mitigating circumstance of a kind, or to a degree, not adequately taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines that should result in a sentence different from that described. In determining whether a circumstance was adequately taken into consideration, the court shall consider only the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary of the Sentencing Commission. In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline, the court shall impose an appropriate sentence, having due regard for the purposes set forth in subsection (a)(2). In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline in the case of an offense other than a petty offense, the court shall also have due regard for the relationship of the sentence imposed to sentences prescribed by guidelines applicable to similar offenses and offenders, and to the applicable policy statements of the Sentencing Commission.

(2) CHILD CRIMES AND SEXUAL OFFENSES.—

(A) [2] Sentencing.—In sentencing a defendant convicted of an offense under section 1201 involving a minor victim, an offense under section 1591, or an offense under chapter 71, 109A, 110, or 117, the court shall impose a sentence of the kind, and within the range, referred to in subsection (a)(4) unless—

(i)

the court finds that there exists an aggravating circumstance of a kind, or to a degree, not adequately taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines that should result in a sentence greater than that described;

(ii) the court finds that there exists a mitigating circumstance of a kind or to a degree, that—

(I)

has been affirmatively and specifically identified as a permissible ground of downward departure in the sentencing guidelines or policy statements issued under [section 994\(a\) of title 28](#), taking account of any amendments to such sentencing guidelines or policy statements by Congress;

(II)

has not been taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines; and

(III)

should result in a sentence different from that described; or

(iii)

the court finds, on motion of the Government, that the defendant has provided substantial assistance in the investigation or prosecution of another person who has committed an offense and that this assistance established a mitigating circumstance of a kind, or to a degree, not adequately taken into consideration by the Sentencing Commission in formulating the guidelines that should result in a sentence lower than that described.

In determining whether a circumstance was adequately taken into consideration, the court shall consider only the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary of the Sentencing Commission, together with any amendments thereto by act of Congress. In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline, the court shall impose an appropriate sentence, having due regard for the purposes set forth in subsection (a)(2). In the absence of an applicable sentencing guideline in the case of an offense other than a petty offense, the court shall also have due regard for the relationship of the sentence imposed to sentences prescribed by guidelines applicable to similar offenses and offenders, and to the applicable policy statements of the Sentencing Commission, together with any amendments to such guidelines or policy statements by act of Congress.

(c) STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR IMPOSING A SENTENCE.—The court, at the time of sentencing, shall state in open court the reasons for its imposition of the particular sentence, and, if the sentence—

(1)

is of the kind, and within the range, described in subsection (a)(4), and that range exceeds 24 months, the reason for imposing a sentence at a particular point within the range; or

(2)

is not of the kind, or is outside the range, described in subsection (a)(4), the specific reason for the imposition of a sentence different from that described, which reasons must also be stated with specificity in a statement of reasons form issued under [section 994\(w\)\(1\)\(B\) of title 28](#), except to the extent that the court relies upon statements received in camera in accordance with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32. In the event that the court relies upon statements received in camera in accordance with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32 the court shall state that such statements were so received and that it relied upon the content of such statements.

If the court does not order restitution, or orders only partial restitution, the court shall include in the statement the reason therefor. The court shall provide a transcription or other appropriate public record of the court's statement of reasons, together with the order of judgment and commitment, to the Probation System and to the Sentencing Commission, [\[3\]](#) and, if the sentence includes a term of

imprisonment, to the Bureau of Prisons.

(d) PRESENTENCE PROCEDURE FOR AN ORDER OF NOTICE.—Prior to imposing an order of notice pursuant to section 3555, the court shall give notice to the defendant and the Government that it is considering imposing such an order. Upon motion of the defendant or the Government, or on its own motion, the court shall—

(1)

permit the defendant and the Government to submit affidavits and written memoranda addressing matters relevant to the imposition of such an order;

(2)

afford counsel an opportunity in open court to address orally the appropriateness of the imposition of such an order; and

(3)

include in its statement of reasons pursuant to subsection (c) specific reasons underlying its determinations regarding the nature of such an order.

Upon motion of the defendant or the Government, or on its own motion, the court may in its discretion employ any additional procedures that it concludes will not unduly complicate or prolong the sentencing process.

(e) LIMITED AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE A SENTENCE BELOW A STATUTORY MINIMUM.—

Upon motion of the Government, the court shall have the authority to impose a sentence below a level established by statute as a minimum sentence so as to reflect a defendant's substantial assistance in the investigation or prosecution of another person who has committed an offense. Such sentence shall be imposed in accordance with the guidelines and policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to [section 994 of title 28](#), United States Code.

(f) LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY OF STATUTORY MINIMUMS IN CERTAIN CASES.—

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of an offense under section 401, 404, or 406 of the Controlled Substances Act ([21 U.S.C. 841](#), 844, 846) or section 1010 or 1013 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act ([21 U.S.C. 960](#), 963), the court shall impose a sentence pursuant to guidelines promulgated by the United States Sentencing Commission under [section 994 of title 28](#) without regard to any statutory minimum sentence, if the court finds at sentencing, after the Government has been afforded the opportunity to make a recommendation, that—

(1)

the defendant does not have more than 1 criminal history point, as determined under the sentencing guidelines;

(2)

the defendant did not use violence or credible threats of violence or possess a firearm or other dangerous weapon (or induce another participant to do so) in connection with the offense;

(3)

the offense did not result in death or serious bodily injury to any person;

(4)

the defendant was not an organizer, leader, manager, or supervisor of others in the offense, as determined under the sentencing guidelines and was not engaged in a

continuing criminal enterprise, as defined in section 408 of the Controlled Substances Act; and

(5)

not later than the time of the sentencing hearing, the defendant has truthfully provided to the Government all information and evidence the defendant has concerning the offense or offenses that were part of the same course of conduct or of a common scheme or plan, but the fact that the defendant has no relevant or useful other information to provide or that the Government is already aware of the information shall not preclude a determination by the court that the defendant has complied with this requirement.