

No. _____

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

OYEYEMI OWAGBORIAYE,
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent.

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

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MICHAEL CARUSO
Federal Public Defender
ANSHU BUDHRANI
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Counsel of Record
150 West Flagler Street
Suite 1700
Miami, FL 33130
305-530-7000

Counsel for Petitioner

APPENDIX

TABLE OF APPENDIX

Appendix A: Opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit (Mar. 29, 2022)	1a
---	----

APPENDIX A

2022 WL 906926

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.
United States Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit.

UNITED STATES of America, Plaintiff-Appellee,
v.
Oyeyemi Olatunji OWAGBORIAYE,
a.k.a. Prince, Defendant-Appellant.

No. 20-11018

I

Filed: 03/29/2022

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern
District of Florida, D.C. Docket No. 1:18-cr-20361-KMW-2

Attorneys and Law Firms

U.S. Attorney Service, [Jason Wu](#), Assistant U.S. Attorney,
Emily M. Smachetti, U.S. Attorney's Office, Miami, FL,
Sivashree Sundaram, U.S. Attorney's Office, West Palm
Beach, FL, for Plaintiff-Appellee.

[Anshu Budhrani](#), Julie Erin Holt, [Michael Caruso](#), Federal
Public Defender, Federal Public Defender's Office, [Arun
Ravindran](#), Hedin Hall, LLP, Miami, FL, for Defendant-
Appellant.

Before [Wilson](#), [Rosenbaum](#), Circuit Judges, and Covington, ^{*}
District Judge.

Opinion

PER CURIAM:

***1** The court has considered all of Defendant-Appellant
Oyeyemi Owagboriaye's specifications of error, including:

1. Whether the district court erred in denying Appellant's motion to suppress evidence?
2. Whether the district court abused its discretion when it admitted the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) but denied Appellant's request to submit corresponding documents under the Rule of Completeness?
3. Whether the district court erred in denying Appellant's proposed jury instruction on his theory of defense and aiding and abetting?
4. Whether the district court erred in denying Appellant's motion to dismiss the indictment?
5. Was the evidence sufficient to support Appellant's conviction for wire fraud?
6. Whether the government's introduction of the MOU proved a different scheme to defraud and thus materially varied from the indictment and prejudice Appellant?

After review and consideration of the briefs and the record, and having the benefit of oral argument, we find no reversible error in the district court's proceedings. Therefore, the district court's decision is affirmed.

AFFIRMED.

All Citations

Not Reported in Fed. Rptr., 2022 WL 906926

Footnotes

- ^{*} Honorable Virginia M. Covington, United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, sitting by designation.