

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

---

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

TREVIN NUNNALLY,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Respondent.*

---

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

APPENDIX TO APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

---

MICHAEL UFFERMAN  
Michael Ufferman Law Firm, P.A.  
2202-1 Raymond Diehl Road  
Tallahassee, Florida 32308  
Florida Bar # 114227  
Phone (850) 386-2345  
Email: [ufferman@uffermanlaw.com](mailto:ufferman@uffermanlaw.com)

Counsel for the Petitioner

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Document</b>	<b>Page</b>
1.	February 17, 2023, opinion of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals . . . .	A-1

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

In the  
United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eleventh Circuit

---

No. 20-14009

Non-Argument Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

*versus*

TREVIN NUNNALLY,

a.k.a. Rick,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Florida  
D.C. Docket No. 5:05-cr-00045-MW-GRJ-1

---

ON REMAND FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE  
UNITED STATES

Before JILL PRYOR, LUCK, and ANDERSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

The Supreme Court vacated and remanded our September 27, 2021, opinion affirming the district court’s denial of Trevin Nunnally’s motion for sentence reduction pursuant to the First Step Act of 2018 for reconsideration in light of *Concepcion v. United States*, 142 S. Ct. 2389 (2022).

In our original opinion, we noted that Nunnally acknowledged that the district court did not err in denying his motion because our precedent in *United States v. Jones*, 962 F.3d 1290 (11th Cir. 2020), required the use of the “as if” framework outlined in that opinion. Specifically, that framework states that any reduction in sentence must be “as if sections 2 and 3 of the Fair Sentencing Act . . . were in effect at the time the covered offense was committed” and means that the court cannot reduce a sentence where the movant received the lowest statutory penalty available to him under the Fair Sentencing Act. Nunnally received a sentence equal to the lowest statutory penalty under the Fair Sentencing Act and so we held that the district court did not abuse its discretion when it denied his motion.

After a Supreme Court remand, our court recently held that *Concepcion* did not abrogate the reasoning in *Jones*. *United States v. Jackson*, \_\_\_ F.4th \_\_\_, 2023 WL 1501638 (11th Cir. Feb. 3, 2023). Accordingly, we reinstated our prior opinion in *Jackson*, which followed *Jones*. Because the binding law in our circuit has not changed, we reinstate our prior decision and affirm the district court's denial of relief.

AFFIRMED.