

No. _____

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

Ramadan Tajadeen Shabazz,

Petitioner,

v.

United States of America,

Respondent.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Christopher Curtis
Assistant Federal Public Defender

Federal Public Defender's Office
Northern District of Texas
819 Taylor Street, Room 9A10
Fort Worth, TX 76102
(817) 978-2753
Chris_Curtis@fd.org

QUESTION PRESENTED

- I. Whether this Court should grant certiorari, vacate the sentence and remand to the Fifth Circuit for reconsideration in light of *United States v. Haymond*, 139 S. Ct. 2369 (2019)?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner is Ramadan Tajedeen Shabazz, who was the Defendant-Appellant in the court below. Respondent, the United States of America, was the Plaintiff-Appellee in the court below.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED	ii
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING	iii
INDEX TO APPENDICES	v
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vi
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
STATUTORY AND RULES PROVISIONS	2
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS.....	2
LIST OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS	5
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	6
REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION.....	6
I. This Court should grant certiorari, vacate the sentence and remand to the Fifth Circuit for reconsideration in light of, <i>United States v. Haymond</i>, 139 S.Ct. 2369 (2019)	6
CONCLUSION.....	12

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix A Judgment and Opinion of Fifth Circuit

Appendix B Judgment of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan

Appendix C Judgment of Revocation and Sentence of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Henderson v. United States</i> , 568 U.S. 266 (2013)	6
<i>Johnson v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 461 (1997)	6
<i>United States v. Haymond</i> , 139 S. Ct. 2369 (2019)	<i>passim</i>
<i>United States v. Shabazz</i> , 811 F. App'x 919 (5th Cir. 2020) (unpublished)	1
<i>United States v. Olano</i> , 507 U.S. 725 (1993)	6
 Statutes	
18 U.S.C. § 922(g)	9
18 U.S.C. § 2252(b)(2)	7
18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)	<i>passim</i>
18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)(1)	9
18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)(2)	9
18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)(3)	9
18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)(4)	9
18 U.S.C. § 3583(k)	<i>passim</i>
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)	1
 Rules	
Fed. R. Crim. P. 51	2
Fed. R. Evid. 103	2

U.S. Const. Amend V.....*passim*

U.S. Const. Amend VI.....*passim*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner Ramadan Tajedeen Shabazz seeks a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals is located within the Federal Appendix at *United States v. Ramadan Tajedeen Shabazz*, 811 F. App'x 919 (5th Cir. 2020) (unpublished). It is reprinted in Appendix A to this Petition. The district court's judgment is attached as Appendix B. This petition relates to the revocation of Mr. Shabazz's term of supervised release; the amended judgment of revocation and sentence is attached as Appendix C.

JURISDICTION

The panel opinion and judgment of the Fifth Circuit were entered on July 10, 2020. On March 19, 2020, the Court extended the 90-day deadline to file a petition for certiorari to 150 days.

This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

STATUTORY AND RULES PROVISIONS

Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 51 provides:

(a) Exceptions Unnecessary.

Exceptions to rulings or orders of the court are unnecessary.

(b) Preserving a Claim of Error.

A party may preserve a claim of error by informing the court – when the court ruling or order is made or sought – of the action the party wishes the court to take, or the party's objection to the court's action and the grounds for that objection. If a party does not have an opportunity to object to a ruling or order, the absence of an objection does not later prejudice that party. A ruling or order that admits or excludes evidence is governed by Federal Rule of Evidence 103.

This Petition also involves 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g) which provides the following:

(g) Mandatory revocation for possession of controlled substance or firearm or for refusal to comply with drug testing.--If the defendant--

(1) possesses a controlled substance in violation of the condition set forth in subsection (d);

(2) possesses a firearm, as such term is defined in section 921 of this title, in violation of Federal law, or otherwise violates a condition of supervised release prohibiting the defendant from possessing a firearm;

(3) refuses to comply with drug testing imposed as a condition of supervised release; or

(4) as a part of drug testing, tests positive for illegal controlled substances more than 3 times over the course of 1 year;

the court shall revoke the term of supervised release and require the defendant to serve a term of imprisonment not to exceed the maximum term of imprisonment authorized under subsection (e)(3).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides in part:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a

Grand Jury . . . nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . .

The Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides in part:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed

LIST OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS

1. *United States v. Ramadan Tajedeen Shabazz*, 2:14-CR-20339-01. United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan. Judgment entered August 26, 2016.
2. *United States v. Ramadan Tajedeen Shabazz*, 3:17-CR-00337-K(01), United States District Court, Northern District of Texas, motion to revoke term of supervised release filed on July 31, 2019. Judgment revoking supervised release and imposing a 24-month term of imprisonment and a 12-month term of supervised release was entered on August 2, 2019.
3. *United States v. Ramadan Tajedeen Shabazz*, CA No. 19-10896, United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Opinion and judgment affirming the sentence entered July 10, 2020, and amended August 3, 2020.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Ramadan Tajedeen Shabazz (“Shabazz”) was originally sentenced on November 28, 2017, to 60 months in prison and three years of supervised release for wire fraud. (ROA.19–26).¹ Mr. Shabazz’s term of supervised release commenced on June 27, 2018. (ROA.40). And—even though the Petition for Offender Under Supervision, the addendum to that petition, and the Motion to Revoke failed to state that the alleged violations, if true, would result in mandatory revocation, *see* (ROA.40–44, 55–61)—the court concluded that Shabazz’s supervised release should be revoked, despite hearing no arguments about the propriety of revocation, because the court’s probation officer stated that the failure to submit to urinalysis testing caused revocation to be mandatory. (ROA.162–63).

On appeal, Shabazz raised three points of error, including one arguing that the district court’s application of the mandatory revocation statute was unconstitutional in light of this Court’s decision in *United States v. Haymond*, 139 S. Ct. 2369 (2019). The court of appeals, however, determined that Shabazz did not prove plain error. *See* Appendix A.

¹ For the convenience of the Court and the parties, the Petitioner has included citations to the page number of the record on appeal below.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION

I. This Court should grant certiorari, vacate the sentence and remand to the Fifth Circuit for reconsideration in light of, *United States v. Haymond*, 139 S.Ct. 2369 (2019).

This Court’s plurality decision in *Haymond* makes clear that, even in the context of supervised release, “a jury must find any facts that trigger a *new* mandatory prison term.” *Haymond*, 139 S.Ct. 2369, 2380 (2019) (emphasis in original). Here, Shabazz was sentenced under a statute that required mandatory imprisonment after failing to afford him the right to a jury trial to determine the truth of the allegations against him.

This issue was not raised in the trial court. The Petitioner’s claim of error must be reviewed by the plain error standard of review. *See United States v. Olano*, 507 U.S. 725, 732 (1993). However, in determining whether error is plain, “it is enough that the error be plain at the time of appellate consideration.” *Henderson v. United States*, 568 U.S. 266, 274 (2013) quoting *Johnson v. United States*, 520 U.S. 461, 468 (1997) (“We agree with petitioner on this point, and hold that in a case such as this – where the law at the time of trial was settled and clearly contrary to the law at the time of the appeal – it is enough that an error be ‘plain’ at the time of appellate consideration.”).

From the opening paragraph of *Haymond*, the plurality made clear that the mandatory revocation statute of 18 U.S.C. § 3583(k) violated the Constitution by failing to provide the accused with the right to a jury and the reasonable doubt standard:

Only a jury, acting on proof beyond a reasonable doubt, may take a person’s liberty. That promise stands as one of the Constitution’s most

vital protections against arbitrary government. Yet in this case a congressional statute compelled a federal judge to send a man to prison . . . without empaneling a jury of his peers or requiring the government to prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. As applied here, we do not hesitate to hold that the statute violates the Fifth and Sixth Amendments.

Haymond, 139 S.Ct. at 2373.

In his initial trial, Mr. Haymond was convicted of possessing child pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2252(b)(2). *Id.* Mr. Haymond was sentenced to 38 months' imprisonment and 10 years of supervised release. *Id.* After completing his prison sentence and beginning his term of supervised release, Mr. Haymond was found with several "images that appeared to be child pornography" on his phone. *Id.* at 2374. The government moved to revoke Mr. Haymond's supervised release and imposed a new, additional prison sentence. *Id.*

After a hearing, the district judge found by a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Haymond possessed some of the images. *Id.* The district judge felt "bound by [18 U.S.C. § 3583(k)] to impose an additional term of prison." *Id.* at 2375.

Section 3583(k) of United States Code Title 18 states in relevant part:

Notwithstanding subsection (b), the authorized term of supervised release for any offense under section 1201 involving a minor victim, and for any offense under section 1591, 1594(c), 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2250, 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425, is any term of years not less than 5, or life. If a defendant required to register under the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act commits any criminal offense under chapter 109A, 110, or 117, or section 1201 or 1591, for which imprisonment for a term longer than 1 year can be imposed, the court shall revoke the term of supervised release and require the defendant to serve a term of imprisonment under subsection (e)(3) without regard to the exception contained therein. Such term shall be not less than 5 years.

18 U.S.C.A. § 3583(k).

On appeal, Mr. Haymond challenged the constitutionality of the punishment, and the Tenth Circuit concluded that § 3583(k) violated the Fifth and Sixth Amendment. *Id.* The Tenth Circuit concluded that the last two sentences of § 3583(k) were “unconstitutional and unenforceable.” *Id.* (citing 869 F.3d 1153, 1168 (10th Cir. 2017)).

On review this Court explained:

[T]he Framers adopted the Sixth Amendment’s promise that “[i]n all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury.” In the Fifth Amendment, they added that no one may be deprived of liberty without “due process of law.” Together, these pillars of the Bill of Rights ensure that the government must prove to a jury every criminal charge beyond a reasonable doubt, an ancient rule that has “extend[ed] down centuries.”

Id. at 2376 (citing *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466, 477 (2000)).

Despite these rights, the Court noted that Mr. Haymond’s revocation involved “a judge—acting without a jury and based only on a preponderance of the evidence—[who] found that Mr. Haymond had engaged in additional conduct in violation of the terms of his supervised release.” *Id.* at 2378. Then, “[u]nder § 3583(k), that judicial fact-finding triggered a new punishment in the form of a prison term of at least five years and up to life. [Thus,] the facts the judge found here increased ‘the legally prescribed range of allowable sentences’ in violation of the Fifth and Sixth Amendments.” *Id.* (citing *Alleyne v. United States*, 570 U.S. 99 (2013)).

Our precedents, *Apprendi*, *Blakely*, and *Alleyne* included, have repeatedly rejected efforts to dodge the demands of the Fifth and Sixth Amendments by the simple expedient of relabeling a criminal prosecution a “sentencing enhancement.” Calling part of a criminal prosecution a “sentence modification” imposed at a “postjudgment sentence-administration proceeding” can fare no better. As this Court

has repeatedly explained, any “increase in a defendant’s authorized punishment contingent on the finding of a fact” requires a jury and proof beyond a reasonable doubt “no matter” what the government chooses to call the exercise.

Id. at 2379.

In a concurrence, Justice Breyer did not go so far. In his view supervised release may be likened to parole, violations of which may be ordinarily found without the aid of a jury. *See Id.* at 2385 (Breyer, J., concurring). But he vacated Mr. Haymond’s sentence because of three features of 3583(k):

First, § 3583(k) applies only when a defendant commits a discrete set of federal criminal offenses specified in the statute. Second, § 3583(k) takes away the judge’s discretion to decide whether violation of a condition of supervised release should result in imprisonment and for how long. Third, § 3583(k) limits the judge’s discretion in a particular manner: by imposing a mandatory minimum term of imprisonment of “not less than 5 years” upon a judge’s finding that a defendant has “commit[ted] any” listed “criminal offense.”

Id. at 2386.

Two of the three of these criteria are present in 3583(g). Subsection (g) names “a discrete set of federal criminal offenses,” namely: unlawful possession of controlled substances, 3583(g)(1), possession of a firearm (necessarily a violation of 18 U.S.C. 922(g) when the underlying offense is a felony), 3583(g)(2), and repeated use of a controlled substance, as evidenced by positive drug tests, 3583(g)(4). The only other basis for mandatory revocation named in 3583(g)(3) – non-compliance with drug testing – is so closely associated with illegal drug use as to be essentially a means of proving a discrete federal offense. The statute thus creates the appearance of a legislative effort to provide punishment for criminal offenses while circumventing

cumbersome constitutional guarantees. *See Id.* at 2381 (Gorsuch, J., plurality op.) (“If the government were right, a jury’s conviction on one crime would (again) permit perpetual supervised release and allow the government to evade the need for another jury trial on any other offense the defendant might commit, no matter how grave the punishment.”)

Here, like Mr. Haymond, Shabazz also had his supervised release revoked and was subjected to mandatory imprisonment without being afforded the right to a jury trial and the beyond a reasonable doubt standard. At the sentencing hearing, the probation officer reported that Shabazz faced “[m]andatory revocation for refusal to comply with drug testing.” (ROA.162).

Section 3583(g) of Title 18 of the United States Code provides:

(g) Mandatory revocation for possession of controlled substance or firearm or for refusal to comply with drug testing.--If the defendant--

(1) possesses a controlled substance in violation of the condition set forth in subsection (d);

(2) possesses a firearm, as such term is defined in section 921 of this title, in violation of Federal law, or otherwise violates a condition of supervised release prohibiting the defendant from possessing a firearm;

(3) refuses to comply with drug testing imposed as a condition of supervised release; or

(4) as a part of drug testing, tests positive for illegal controlled substances more than 3 times over the course of 1 year;

the court shall revoke the term of supervised release and require the defendant to serve a term of imprisonment not to exceed the maximum term of imprisonment authorized under subsection (e)(3).

18 U.S.C. § 3583(g). This statute shares substantially similar language to the unconstitutional language of subsection (k): “the court shall revoke the term of

supervised release and require the defendant to serve a term of imprisonment.”

Compare 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g), with 18 U.S.C. § 3583(k).

The application of the mandatory revocation statute of § 3583(g) was illegal under the dictates of *Haymond*.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner respectfully submits that this Court should grant *certiorari* to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Respectfully submitted this 13th day of October, 2020.

**JASON D. HAWKINS
Federal Public Defender
Northern District of Texas**

/s/ Christopher A. Curtis
Christopher Curtis
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Federal Public Defender's Office
819 Taylor Street, Room 9A10
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
Telephone: (978) 767-2746
E-mail: Chris_Curtis@fd.org

Attorney for Petitioner