

20-7594

No. \_\_\_\_\_

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

MAR 19 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Rashawn D. Williams — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

United States — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals - Fourth Circuit  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Rashawn D. Williams  
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 2099  
(Address)

Pollock, LA 71467  
(City, State, Zip Code)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Phone Number)

**QUESTION(S) PRESENTED**

Asking if the 3 judge panel incorrectly upheld my 924(c) conviction and sentence despite the holdings in U.S. v. Davis 903 F.3d 483 (5<sup>th</sup> Circuit 2018) that were affirmed by U.S. v. Davis 139 S.Ct 2319 (2019) since they attached the (and 2) statue which is (Aiding and Abetting) to both counts of my indictment?

## **LIST OF PARTIES**

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

## **RELATED CASES**

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was ~~March 01, 2021~~ January 21, 2021.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: March 01, 2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No.     A    .

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No.     A    .

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

**CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

Under U.S. v. Davis 139 S. Ct. 2319 (2019)  
Aiding and Abetting, Attempt, and Conspiracy  
is Unconstitutionally Vague under the  
924(c) Statute and they attached Aiding  
and Abetting which is the (and 2) statute  
to both counts of my indictment.

### **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

I was convicted of 18 USC 1114 & 2 and 924(c) & 2. I'm not arguing my Attempted murder conviction but the (and 2) statute that's attached to my 924(c) conviction and Sentence being that Aiding and Abetting is Unconstitutionally Vague under the 924(c) Statute.

**REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

I'm respectfully asking this court to grant my petition because of the statue that's attached to both counts of my indictment and it certainly states that a vague law is no law at all.

## **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Rashawn Willis

Date: 03.17.2021