

No. 20-6049

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ISIDORO GONZALEZ-FERRETIZ, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

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

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES

JEFFREY B. WALL
Acting 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. 20-6049

ISIDORO GONZALEZ-FERRETIZ, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

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

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES

Under 8 U.S.C. 1326(d), a defendant charged with unlawful reentry into the United States following removal may assert the invalidity of the original removal order as an affirmative defense only if he “demonstrates” three things, including that the removal proceedings “improperly deprived the alien of the opportunity for judicial review,” 8 U.S.C. 1326(d)(2). Petitioner contends (Pet. 16-18) that the court of appeals erred in refusing to find that he was “deprived” of “the opportunity for judicial review” of the order from his expedited removal proceedings because he signed an appeal waiver without being specifically advised that he could

contest the determination that his crime qualified as a removable offense.

The question that petitioner presents is related to the question currently before the Court in United States v. Palomar-Santiago, cert. granted, No. 20-437 (Jan. 8, 2021). Palomar-Santiago presents the question whether a defendant automatically satisfies the requirements of Section 1326(d) by showing that he was removed for a crime that would not be considered a removable offense under current circuit law, even if he cannot independently demonstrate administrative exhaustion or deprivation of the opportunity for judicial review. Because the proper disposition of the petition for a writ of certiorari in this case may be affected by the Court's resolution of Palomar-Santiago, the petition should be held pending the decision in Palomar-Santiago and then disposed of as appropriate in light of that decision.*

Respectfully submitted.

JEFFREY B. WALL
Acting Solicitor General

JANUARY 2021

* The government waives any further response to the petition for a writ of certiorari unless this Court requests otherwise.