

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

---

---

In the  
Supreme Court of the United States

---

**Regis Storm Ervin,**  
*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

---

Adam Nicholson  
*Assistant Federal Public Defender*

Federal Public Defender's Office  
Northern District of Texas  
525 S. Griffin Street, Suite 629  
Dallas, TX 75202  
(214) 767-2746  
Adam\_Nicholson@fd.org

---

---

## **QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

Whether 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g) comports with the Fifth and Sixth Amendments?

## **PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING**

Petitioner is Regis Storm Ervin, 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

QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	ii
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING .....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
INDEX TO APPENDICES .....	v
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	vi
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI.....	1
OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
RELEVANT STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS .....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION .....	6
I.    This Court should hold the instant Petition pending any plenary grant of certiorari addressing the question presented, which was reserved by the plurality in <i>United States v. Haymond</i> , __U.S.__, 139 S.Ct. 2369 (2019). .....	6
A.    This case presents an unaddressed question from <i>Haymond</i> regarding the continued viability of the mandatory revocation statute of 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g). .....	6
B.    This Court should grant certiorari to address the issue in another case, and hold the instant Petition pending the outcome. ....	8
CONCLUSION.....	9

## **INDEX TO APPENDICES**

Appendix A Opinion of Fifth Circuit

Appendix B Judgment and Sentence Revoking Supervised Release of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas

Appendix C Judgment and Sentence for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>Alleyne v. United States</i> , 570 U.S. 99 (2013) .....	6
<i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> , 530 U.S. 466 (2000) .....	6, 7
<i>Blakely v. Washington</i> , 542 U.S. 296 (2004) .....	7
<i>Borden v. United States</i> , No. 19-5410, 140 S.Ct. 1262 (March 2, 2020) .....	7
<i>Henderson v. United States</i> , 568 U.S. 266 (2013) .....	8
<i>Lawrence on behalf of Lawrence v. Chater</i> , 516 U.S. 163 (1996) .....	8
<i>United States v. Booker</i> , 543 U.S. 220 (2005) .....	6, 7
<i>United States v. Castleman</i> , 572 U.S. 157 (2014) .....	8
<i>United States v. Haymond</i> , __U.S.__, 139 S.Ct. 2369 (2019) .....	5, 6, 7, 8
<i>Voisine v. United States</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2272 (2016) .....	7
<b>Federal Statutes</b>	
18 U.S.C. § 16.....	7
18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) .....	1
18 U.S.C. § 924(e).....	7
18 U.S.C. § 3583(g) .....	2, 5, 6, 7
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) .....	1

## **Rules**

Fed. R. Crim. P. 52(b) .....	8
------------------------------	---

## **Constitutional Provisions**

U.S. CONST. amend. V .....	2, 5, 6
U.S. CONST. amend. VI .....	3, 5, 6, 7
U.S. CONST. art. I, § 8 .....	2

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner Regis Storm Ervin seeks a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

### OPINIONS BELOW

The unpublished opinion of the court of appeals is found at *United States v. Ervin*, No. 21-10883, 2022 WL 1183711 (5th Cir. Apr. 21, 2022). It is reprinted in Appendix A to this Petition. The petition arises from the judgment revoking Petitioner's supervised release. The district court's judgment and sentence revoking supervised release is attached as Appendix B. The district court's original judgment and sentence on a substantive count is attached as Appendix C.

### JURISDICTION

The panel opinion and judgment of the Fifth Circuit were entered on April 21, 2022. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1254(1).

### RELEVANT STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Section 922(g)(1) of Title 18 reads in relevant part:

(g) It shall be unlawful for any person—

(1) who has been convicted in any court of, a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year

\*\*\*

to ship or transport in interstate or foreign commerce, or possess in or affecting commerce, any firearm or ammunition; or to receive any firearm or ammunition which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce.



18 U.S.C. §3583(g) states:

(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).

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution provides in relevant part:

The Congress shall have Power

\*\*\*

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes...

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides:

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.

The Sixth Amendment provides:

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, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

### A. Facts and Proceedings in District Court

On July 10, 2019, Appellant Regis Storm Ervin was sentenced by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to time served (approximately 14 months) and a three-year term of supervised release as the result of a guilty plea to a one-count superseding indictment for Conspiracy to Possess with Intent to Distribute and to Distribute Controlled Substances, a violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1) & (b)(1)(D) and 846. (ROA.16–22). Among the conditions for his term of supervised release included a requirement that he “must participate, under the guidance and supervision of the probation officer, in a substance-abuse treatment program, which must include regular and random drug testing . . . .” (ROA.20).

Mr. Ervin began serving his term of supervised release on October 22, 2019. (ROA.24). On October 15, 2021, Mr. Ervin’s probation officer filed a petition for person under supervision alleging, *inter alia*, that Mr. Ervin had violated his supervised release by failing to submit to required drug testing on eleven occasions between January 24, 2020, and February 2, 2021. (ROA.26). The statutory provisions section of the petition stated, “Mandatory revocation for . . . refusal to comply with drug testing. Sentence to a term of imprisonment.” (ROA.28) (citing 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)(3)). The advisory imprisonment range was 12 to 18 months. (ROA.28).

At the revocation hearing, Mr. Ervin admitted to this and certain other allegations. (ROA.55–57). The district court revoked Mr. Ervin’s supervised release

and sentenced him to a term of imprisonment of twelve months and one day. (ROA.40–41, 61).

**B. Appellate Proceedings**

Petitioner appealed, arguing that the district court erred in applying the mandatory revocation provision of 18 U.S.C. §3583(g), because that provision violated the Fifth and Sixth Amendments under the rationale of *United States v. Haymond*, \_\_U.S.\_\_, 139 S.Ct. 2369 (2019). Petitioner conceded that his claim was foreclosed by circuit precedent, and the court of appeals agreed. *See* [Appx. A]; *United States v. Ervin*, No. 21-10883, 2022 WL 1183711 (5th Cir. Apr. 21, 2022).

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

- I. This Court should hold the instant Petition pending any plenary grant of certiorari addressing the question presented, which was reserved by the plurality in *United States v. Haymond*, \_\_U.S.\_\_, 139 S.Ct. 2369 (2019).**
- A. This case presents an unaddressed question from *Haymond* regarding the continued viability of the mandatory revocation statute of 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g).**

The Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the United States Constitution require that any fact that increases the defendant's maximum or minimum range of punishment must be proven to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. *See Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000); *Alleyne v. United States*, 570 U.S. 99 (2013). Section 3583(g)(3) of Title 18 compels the district court to impose a term of imprisonment when a defendant on supervised release refuses to comply with drug testing imposed as a condition of supervised release. A straightforward application of *Alleyne*, therefore, would tend to show that the fact of such refusal must be proven to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. Alternatively, a reviewing court might conclude that Congress would have preferred to sever and excise the mandatory revocation provision to compelling a full-blown jury trial for every allegation of refusal to comply with required drug testing. *See United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005).

Nonetheless, at least five Justices in *United States v. Haymond*, \_\_U.S.\_\_, 139 S.Ct. 2369 (2019), concluded that some revocation proceedings fall outside the simple rules of *Apprendi* and *Alleyne*. *See Haymond*, 139 S.Ct. at 2385 (Breyer, J., concurring); *id.* at 2391 (Alito, J., dissenting). Under the view propounded by Justice Breyer's concurrence, facts determined in a revocation proceeding should instead be

compared more globally to a “traditional element.” *See id.* at 2385-2386 (Breyer, J., concurring). This analysis considers whether the fact in question sets forth an independent criminal offense, whether it triggers a mandatory minimum, and the length of the mandatory minimum. *See id.* at 2385-2386 (Breyer, J., concurring).

A four-Justice plurality expressly reserved the question at issue in this case: whether 18 U.S.C. 3583(g) violates the Fifth and Sixth Amendment, cautioning:

Just as we have no occasion to decide whether § 3583(k) implicates *Apprendi* by raising the ceiling of permissible punishments beyond those authorized by the jury's verdict, see n. 4, *supra*, we do not pass judgment one way or the other on § 3583(e)'s consistency with *Apprendi*. Nor do we express a view on the mandatory revocation provision for certain drug and gun violations in § 3583(g), which requires courts to impose “a term of imprisonment” of unspecified length.

*Id.* (Gorsuch, J.)(plurality op.), 139 S. Ct. at 2382. Such reservations have previously foreshadowed grants of certiorari on the reserved issue, often promptly. ***Compare*** *Blakely v. Washington*, 542 U.S. 296, 305, n.9 (2004)(“The Federal Guidelines are not before us, and we express no opinion on them.”) ***with*** *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005)(rendering a holding on this question); ***compare*** *Voisine v. United States*, 136 S. Ct. 2272, 2280, n.4 (2016)(Like *Leocal*, our decision today concerning § 921(a)(33)(A)'s scope does not resolve whether § 16 includes reckless behavior.”) ***with*** *Borden v. United States*, No. 19-5410, 140 S.Ct. 1262 (March 2, 2020)(granting certiorari to decide this question in the context of 18 U.S.C. 924(e), which contains a clause similarly worded to 18 U.S.C. 16); ***see also*** *Voisine*, 136 S. Ct. at 2277 (“...we expressly left open whether a reckless assault also qualifies as a “use” of force—so that a misdemeanor conviction for such conduct would trigger § 922(g)(9)'s firearms

ban. . . . The two cases before us now raise that issue.”)(internal citations omitted)(citing *United States v. Castleman*, 572 U.S. 157 (2014)).

**B. This Court should grant certiorari to address the issue in another case, and hold the instant Petition pending the outcome.**

Because Petitioner did not challenge the constitutionality of the mandatory revocation statute at the district court he likely presents an insurmountable vehicle problem for a plenary grant in the present case. Nonetheless, the issue is worthy of certiorari, and the Court has no shortage of cases presenting it.

In the event that the Court chooses to address this issue while the instant case remains on direct appeal, the outcome may be affected. Although the error was not preserved in district court, which compels review for plain error only, *see* Fed. R. Crim. P. 52(b), the “plain-ness” of error may be established by change of precedent on before the judgment is final. *See Henderson v. United States*, 568 U.S. 266 (2013). Accordingly, Petitioner requests that the Court hold his petition pending any case that presents the issue reserved in *Haymond*, and then grant the petition, vacate the judgment below, and remand for reconsideration. *See Lawrence on behalf of Lawrence v. Chater*, 516 U.S. 163 (1996).

## 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 20th day of July, 2022.

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

/s/ Adam Nicholson  
Adam Nicholson  
Assistant Federal Public Defender  
Federal Public Defender's Office  
525 S. Griffin Street, Suite 629  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
Telephone: (214) 767-2746  
E-mail: adam\_nicholson@fd.org

*Attorney for Petitioner*