

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

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

JOHN PAUL LOPEZ, *PETITIONER*,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *RESPONDENT*

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

---

MAUREEN SCOTT FRANCO  
Federal Public Defender

BRADFORD W. BOGAN  
Assistant Federal Public Defender  
Western District of Texas  
300 Convent Street, Suite 2300  
San Antonio, Texas 78205  
(210) 472-6700  
(210) 472-4454 (Fax)

*Counsel of Record for Petitioner*

---

## **QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW**

When a district court imposes a term of supervised release as part of a sentence, the United States Sentencing Commission recommends imposing a long list of “standard” conditions of supervised release. Standard Condition 12 reads:

If the probation officer determines that the defendant poses a risk to another person (including an organization), the probation officer may require the defendant to notify the person about the risk and the defendant shall comply with that instruction. The probation officer may contact the person and confirm that the defendant has notified the person about the risk.

U.S.S.G. §5D1.3(c)(12), p.s. The question presented is:

Does Standard Condition 12 unconstitutionally delegate judicial authority to the probation officer?

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

In the Supreme Court of the United States

---

JOHN PAUL LOPEZ, *PETITIONER*,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *RESPONDENT*

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH  
CIRCUIT**

---

Petitioner John Paul Lopez asks that a writ of certiorari issue to review the opinion and judgment entered by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit on August 2, 2023.

**PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING**

The caption of this case names all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is sought to be reviewed.

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

- *United States v. Lopez*, No. 6:21-CR-107-ADA-1 (W.D. Tex.) (criminal judgment entered Nov. 2, 2022)
- *United States v. Lopez*, No. 22-51014 (5th Cir.) (judgment entered Aug. 2, 2023)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.....	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING .....	ii
RELATED PROCEEDINGS.....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iv
OPINION BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.....	1
FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINE INVOLVED .....	1
STATEMENT .....	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	5
The Court should grant certiorari to say whether Standard Condition 12 impermissibly delegates judicial authority to the probation officer. ....	5
CONCLUSION.....	12
APPENDIX	
<i>United States v. Lopez</i> , .....	1a–2a
No. 22-51014,	
(5th Cir. Aug. 2, 2023) (per curiam) (unpublished)	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Sealed Appellee v. Sealed Appellant</i> , 937 F.3d 392 (5th Cir. 2019).....	9
<i>United States v. Boyd</i> , 5 F.4th 550 (4th Cir. 2021) .....	9
<i>United States v. Cabral</i> , 926 F.3d 687 (10th Cir. 2019).....	8–9, 11
<i>United States v. Campbell</i> , 77 F.4th 424 (6th Cir. 2023) .....	8, 10
<i>United States v. Cruz</i> , 49 F.4th 646 (1st Cir. 2022).....	8
<i>United States v. Franklin</i> , 838 F.3d 564 (5th Cir. 2016).....	9
<i>United States v. Huerta</i> , 994 F.3d 711 (5th Cir. 2021).....	9–11
<i>United States v. Janis</i> , 995 F.3d 647 (8th Cir. 2021).....	8
<i>United States v. Martinez</i> , 987 F.3d 432 (5th Cir. 2021).....	10–11
<i>United States v. Medel-Guadalupe</i> , 987 F.3d 424 (5th Cir. 2021) (per curiam) .....	10
<i>United States v. Mejia-Banegas</i> , 32 F.4th 450 (5th Cir. 2022) .....	4, 7
<i>United States v. Nash</i> , 438 F.3d 1302 (11th Cir. 2006) (per curiam) .....	7

<i>United States v. Oliver</i> , No. 20-4500, 2022 WL 1223716 (4th Cir. 2022) (per curiam) (unpublished).....	9
<i>United States v. Porter</i> , 842 F. App'x 547 (11th Cir. 2021) (per curiam).....	7
<i>United States v. Thompson</i> , 777 F.3d 368 (7th Cir. 2015).....	3
<b>Statutes</b>	
18 U.S.C. § 924(c).....	2
18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1) .....	5
18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(B) .....	5–6
18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(C) .....	5–6
18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(D).....	5–6
18 U.S.C. § 3563(b) .....	6
18 U.S.C. § 3583(a) .....	5
18 U.S.C. § 3583(d) .....	5–6
18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3) .....	5
21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1).....	2
21 U.S.C. § 841(b)(1)(B)(viii) .....	2
21 U.S.C. § 846.....	2
28 U.S.C. § 994(a) .....	6
28 U.S.C. § 994(a)(2)(B) .....	6
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) .....	1

## **Rules**

Fed. R. Crim. P. 32.1.....	7
Sup. Ct. R. 13.1 .....	1

## **United States Sentencing Guidelines**

U.S.S.G. §5D1.3(c), p.s. (Nov. 2021).....	6
U.S.S.G. §5D1.3(c)(12), p.s. ....	i, 1, 6, 10–11
U.S.S.G. §5D1.3(c)(12), p.s. (Nov. 2021) .....	2
U.S.S.G. §5D1.3(c)(13), p.s. (Nov. 2015) .....	3
U.S.S.G. App. C, amend. 803 (Nov. 1, 2016) .....	3

## **Other Authorities**

Order, Conditions of Probation and Supervised Release (W.D. Tex. Nov. 28, 2016) .....	2–3
--	-----

## OPINION BELOW

A copy of the opinion of the court of appeals, *United States v. Lopez*, No. 22-51014 (5th Cir. 2023) (per curiam) (unpublished), is reproduced at Pet. App. 1a–2a.

## JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The opinion and judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit were entered on August 2, 2023. This petition is filed within 90 days after entry of the judgment. *See* Sup. Ct. R. 13.1. The Court has jurisdiction to grant certiorari under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

## FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINE INVOLVED

United States Sentencing Guidelines policy statement §5D1.3(c)(12) recommends, as a “standard” condition of supervised release:

If the probation officer determines that the defendant poses a risk to another person (including an organization), the probation officer may require the defendant to notify the person about the risk and the defendant shall comply with that instruction. The probation officer may contact the person and confirm that the defendant has notified the person about the risk.



## STATEMENT

Lopez pleaded guilty to a two-count indictment charging him with 1) possessing at least 50 grams of methamphetamine mixture with the intent to distribute it, 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 841(b)(1)(B)(viii), 846; and 2) possessing a firearm in furtherance of that drug-trafficking crime, 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).

The drug charge carried a mandatory minimum supervised release term of four years; for the gun charge, the maximum supervised release term was three years. The presentence report recommended imposition of “the mandatory and standard conditions of probation and supervised release adopted by the Western District of Texas (as amended on November 28, 2016—Standing Order).”<sup>1</sup> One of the conditions from the standing order—standard condition 12, drawn from Sentencing Guidelines policy statement §5D1.3(c)(12)—delegates to the probation officer the authority to require a defendant to notify people of any risk he may pose to them:

If the probation officer determines that the defendant poses a risk to another person (including an organization), the

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at <https://www.txwd.uscourts.gov/wp-content/uploads/Standing%20Orders/District/Conditions%20of%20Probation%20and%20Supervised%20Release.pdf>.

probation officer may require the defendant to notify the person about the risk and the defendant shall comply with that instruction. The probation officer may contact the person and confirm that the defendant has notified the person about the risk.

*See* Order, Conditions of Probation and Supervised Release (W.D. Tex. Nov. 28, 2016). Lopez objected to the risk-notification condition, arguing that it was unconstitutionally vague.<sup>2</sup>

At sentencing, the district court imposed 188 months' imprisonment on the drug count, plus a consecutive 60 months on the gun count. The court also imposed concurrent supervised release terms of four years on the drug count and three years on the gun

---

<sup>2</sup> Lopez was apparently confused about which version of the condition the PSR had recommended. In his written PSR objection, Lopez referred to the condition as "standard condition' 13, which states:

As directed by the probation officer, the defendant shall notify third parties of the risks that may be occasioned by the defendant's criminal record or personal history or characteristics and shall permit the probation officer to make such notifications, and to confirm the defendant's compliance with such notification requirement.

The quoted language comes from a prior version of the condition, which used to be numbered §5D1.3(c)(13). In 2016, the Sentencing Commission revised the condition to its current form "to address criticism by the Seventh Circuit regarding potential ambiguity in how the condition is ... phrased. *See United States v. Thompson*, 777 F.3d 368, 379 (7th Cir. 2015)." U.S.S.G. App. C, amend. 803.

count. The court overruled Lopez’s objection to the risk-notification condition, adopted the PSR, and “impose[d] the mandatory and standard conditions of probation and supervised release in the district-wide standing order of November 28, 2016.” The judgment included all those conditions, including the risk-notification condition.<sup>3</sup>

Lopez appealed. He argued that the risk-notification condition impermissibly delegates judicial power to the probation officer. Pet. App. 2a. The Fifth Circuit rejected Lopez’s argument as foreclosed by its recent decision in *United States v. Mejia-Banegas*, 32 F.4th 450 (5th Cir. 2022), and granted the Government’s motion for summary affirmance on that basis. Pet. App. 2a.

---

<sup>3</sup> The condition is listed in the judgment as standard condition 6. Due to an apparent formatting error, a different condition on the preceding page of the judgment (requiring Lopez to allow the probation officer to visit him anywhere at any time) is also listed as standard condition 6. For clarity, this petition refers to the contested condition as the “risk-notification condition,” rather than by number.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

**The Court should grant certiorari to say whether Standard Condition 12 impermissibly delegates judicial authority to the probation officer.**

Federal sentencing courts may, and in some cases must, “include as part of the sentence a requirement that the defendant be placed on a term of supervised release after imprisonment.” 18 U.S.C. § 3583(a). Defendants on supervised release must abide by the conditions imposed by the sentencing court. If the defendant violates a supervised release condition, the court may revoke the term of supervised release and require the defendant to serve additional prison time, followed by an additional period of supervised release after the defendant’s release. 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3).

Some supervised release conditions are expressly required by statute. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(d) (enumerating mandatory standard release conditions, such as conditions that defendants not commit future crimes, make restitution, and not unlawfully possess controlled substances). In addition to those conditions, Congress has provided:

The court may order, as a further condition of supervised release, to the extent that such condition—

- (1) is reasonably related to the factors set forth in section 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C), and (a)(2)(D);

- (2) involves no greater deprivation of liberty than is reasonably necessary for the purposes set forth in section 3553(a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C), and (a)(2)(D); and
- (3) is consistent with any pertinent policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(a); any condition set forth as a discretionary condition of probation in section 3563(b) and any other condition it considers to be appropriate.

18 U.S.C. § 3583(d).

Congress has also authorized the Sentencing Commission to promulgate “general policy statements” regarding “the conditions of probation and supervised release set forth in sections 3563(b) and 3583(d) of title 18.” 28 U.S.C. § 994(a)(2)(B). Pursuant to that authority, the Sentencing Commission has promulgated a policy statement containing a series of “‘standard’ conditions” that “are recommended for supervised release.” U.S.S.G. §5D1.3(c), p.s.

One of those conditions—Standard Condition 12—delegates to the probation officer the authority to require a defendant to notify people of any risk he may pose to them:

If the probation officer determines that the defendant poses a risk to another person (including an organization), the probation officer may require the defendant to notify the person about the risk and the defendant shall comply with that instruction. The probation officer may contact the person and confirm that the defendant has notified the person about the risk.

U.S.S.G. §5D1.3(c)(12), p.s.

The circuits are divided over whether Standard Condition 12 is an impermissible delegation of Article III judicial authority to the probation officer. The Fifth Circuit has held that the condition is not an impermissible delegation. *United States v. Mejia-Banegas*, 32 F.4th 450 (5th Cir. 2022) (per curiam). Following the Eleventh Circuit’s lead, the Fifth Circuit concluded that there is no delegation problem because “the probation officer does not unilaterally decide whether the defendant is subject to the condition. Rather, the risk-notification condition only allows the probation officer to direct when, where, and to whom the defendant must give notice.” *Id.* at 452 (citing *United States v. Nash*, 438 F.3d 1302, 1306 (11th Cir. 2006) (per curiam); and *United States v. Porter*, 842 F. App’x 547, 548 (11th Cir. 2021) (per curiam)). This “limited scope of authority[,]” in the court’s view, “neither leaves to the probation officer the ‘final say’ on whether to impose a condition of supervised release nor implicates a significant deprivation of liberty.” *Id.* The court also found it significant that the condition had escaped challenge for nearly 30 years. *Id.* Finally, the court suggested that a defendant could seek relief under Fed. R. Crim. P. 32.1 if “an overzealous probation officer” abused his delegated authority. *Id.*

The First and Eighth Circuits have likewise rejected delegation challenges to Standard Condition 12. *United States v. Cruz*, 49

F.4th 646, 654 (1st Cir. 2022); *United States v. Janis*, 995 F.3d 647, 653 (8th Cir. 2021).

The Tenth Circuit, by contrast, has held that Standard Condition 12 is an unconstitutional delegation of judicial authority. *United States v. Cabral*, 926 F.3d 687, 697–99 (10th Cir. 2019). “By tasking Mr. Cabral’s probation officer with determining whether Mr. Cabral poses a ‘risk’ to others in any facet of his life and requiring Mr. Cabral to comply with any order to notify someone of any such risk, the district court delegated broad decision-making authority to the probation officer that could implicate a variety of liberty interests.” *Id.* at 697. The court pointed to the district court’s recognition that the condition could be applied to numerous unanticipated risks. *Id.* at 697–98. It emphasized that the risk-notification condition could affect Cabral’s family relationships and employment prospects. *Id.* at 698–99. “Because the risk-notification condition, as imposed by the district court, grants Mr. Cabral’s probation officer decision-making authority that could infringe on a wide variety of liberty interests, it is an improper delegation of judicial power.” *Id.* at 699; *see also United States v. Campbell*, 77 F.4th 424, 432 (6th Cir. 2023) (holding that district court’s “expla[nation] that if there were ‘any questions or concerns,’ the court would ‘take [the issue] up’ to ‘resolve’ it ... was enough to satisfy

any delegation concerns under our precedent.”) (second alteration in original); *United States v. Oliver*, No. 20-4500, 2022 WL 1223716, at \*6 n.6 (4th Cir. 2022) (per curiam) (unpublished) (noting that “[w]e have suggested that imposing this condition without giving the probation officer meaningful guidance in applying it may be an improper delegation of judicial power[.]” citing *United States v. Boyd*, 5 F.4th 550, 558 (4th Cir. 2021)).

The Tenth Circuit has the better view, one that is consistent with the Fifth Circuit’s precedent on other improper delegations. “The imposition of a sentence, including the terms and conditions of supervised release, is a core judicial function that cannot be delegated.” *Sealed Appellee v. Sealed Appellant*, 937 F.3d 392, 400 (5th Cir. 2019) (quoting *United States v. Franklin*, 838 F.3d 564, 568 (5th Cir. 2016)); see *Cabral*, 926 F.3d at 697. “This limitation comes from Article III of the Constitution, which entrusts judicial functions to the judicial branch.” *United States v. Huerta*, 994 F.3d 711, 716 (5th Cir. 2021) (citing *Franklin*, 838 F.3d at 567–68); see *Cabral*, 926 F.3d at 697. Thus, “[i]n the context of conditions of supervised release, a district court may delegate only the ‘details’ of the conditions; it may not delegate imposition of the conditions themselves.” *Huerta*, 994 F.3d at 716.



Standard Condition 12 falls on the wrong side of that line. The condition grants the probation officer sole authority to decide whether a defendant poses a risk to anyone: “If the probation officer determines that the defendant poses a risk to another person (including an organization) ....” U.S.S.G. §5D1.3(c)(12), p.s. Even then, the condition does not *require* notification; that is entirely up to the probation officer: “the probation officer *may* require the defendant to notify the person about the risk[.]” *Id.* (emphasis added). And the condition contains no guidance about the type or degree of risk sufficient to trigger the notification requirement. The condition is, quite simply, a blank check to the probation officer.

These features of the risk-notification condition transgress two principles undergirding the rule against delegating judicial power to a non-Article III actor. First, “‘the district court [must] have the final say’ on whether to impose a condition.” *Huerta*, 994 F.3d at 716–17 (quoting *United States v. Medel-Guadalupe*, 987 F.3d 424, 431 (5th Cir. 2021) (per curiam)); *see also United States v. Martinez*, 987 F.3d 432, 435 (5th Cir. 2021); *Campbell*, 77 F.4th at 432 (rejecting challenge to this risk-notification condition where “the record indicate[d] that the [district] court reserved the ‘ultimate

authority’ to determine the condition’s contours”). Here, the probation officer has the final say about whether to impose the condition. Second, although a district court may delegate to a probation officer the details of administering a condition, the officer’s authority “ends when the condition involves a ‘significant deprivation of liberty.’” *Huerta*, 994 F.3d at 717 (quoting *Martinez*, 987 F.3d at 434, 436); see *Cabral*, 926 F.3d at 697–99. Here, the condition can lead to a significant deprivation of liberty, because it requires the defendant him to abide by the officer’s dictates: “[T]he defendant *shall* comply with that instruction.” U.S.S.G. §5D1.3(c)(12), p.s.

The Court should grant certiorari and reverse the Fifth Circuit’s decision upholding Standard Condition 12.

**CONCLUSION**

FOR THESE REASONS, Lopez asks this Honorable Court to grant a writ of certiorari.

Respectfully submitted.

MAUREEN SCOTT FRANCO  
Federal Public Defender  
Western District of Texas  
300 Convent Street, Suite 2300  
San Antonio, Texas 78205  
Tel.: (210) 472-6700  
Fax: (210) 472-4454

s/ Bradford W. Bogan  
BRADFORD W. BOGAN  
Assistant Federal Public Defender

*Counsel of Record for Petitioner*

DATED: October 31, 2023