

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 2020

MICHAEL CHRISTOPHER LAIRD,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

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

***DANIEL DONOVAN**
Attorney at Law
P. O. Box 6573
Great Falls, MT 59406
dan@danieldonovanlaw.com
Telephone: 406.868.3753

***Counsel of Record**

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM DECISION

OF THE

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE

NINTH CIRCUIT

United States of America v. Michael Christopher Laird,
No. 19-35860 (9th Cir. October 13, 2020)

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 13 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 19-35860

Plaintiff-Appellee,

D.C. Nos. 4:19-cv-00018-BMM

4:18-cr-00048-BMM-1

v.

MICHAEL CHRISTOPHER LAIRD,

MEMORANDUM*

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Montana
Brian M. Morris, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 7, 2020**
Seattle, Washington

Before: GRABER and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges, and FREUDENTHAL,**
District Judge.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

*** The Honorable Nancy D. Freudenthal, United States District Judge for the District of Wyoming, sitting by designation.

Michael Christopher Laird appeals the district court's denial of his motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1291 and 2253, and we affirm.

In his criminal case, Laird pleaded guilty to possession with intent to distribute 50 grams or more of methamphetamine and was sentenced to 120 months' imprisonment. He timely filed a § 2255 motion asserting ineffective assistance of counsel with respect to his competency and plea. The district court denied the motion on initial review and certified appealability of both issues.

On appeal, Laird argues he was entitled to an evidentiary hearing on his habeas motion to determine competency. Laird, however, waived the right to collaterally attack on grounds other than ineffective assistance of counsel. We consider his competency issue despite the procedural default because he argues that his plea was unknowing and unintelligent, *see Garza v. Idaho*, 139 S. Ct. 738, 745 (2019) (“[D]efendants retain the right to challenge whether the waiver itself is valid and enforceable”), and that he is “actually innocent,” *Bousley v. United States*, 523 U.S. 614, 622 (1998) (noting that a defendant may raise a procedurally defaulted claim on habeas if he demonstrates actual innocence).

The district court properly determined the § 2255 motion without a hearing because Laird did not raise “sufficient facts to create a real and substantial doubt as to his competency.” *Deere v. Woodford*, 339 F.3d 1084, 1086 (9th Cir. 2003), *as*

amended on denial of reh'g (Oct. 2, 2003). The transcripts reflect that Laird's counsel read the plea agreement to him and that he understood his plea and the proceedings. Neither does Laird present new evidence on appeal that would "raise a good faith doubt." *Id.*

Laird next asserts ineffective assistance of counsel in pleading guilty when he was actually innocent of the minimum drug quantity for 21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)(A). We review *de novo*. *Heishman v. Ayers*, 621 F.3d 1030, 1036 (9th Cir. 2010) (per curiam). We conclude that Laird suffered no prejudice. *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 689, 694 (1984). The government offered to prove that Laird sent a 1.7-pound package, and the recipient estimated it contained 50-60 grams of methamphetamine. The next day, only 46.4 grams were found on Laird's companion, but this does not obviate the estimate of what Laird sent. Because that was a sufficient factual basis to accept his plea, Laird did not allege facts inferring actual innocence or that his lawyer's advice was unreasonable. Because the record conclusively showed Laird was not entitled to relief, denial on initial review was proper. 28 U.S.C. § 2255(b).

AFFIRMED.

APPENDIX B
CONSTITUTION
OF THE
UNITED STATES
AMENDMENT V

FIFTH AMENDMENT

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.