

**NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION**

To be cited only in accordance with FED. R. APP. P. 32.1

**United States Court of Appeals**  
for the Seventh Circuit  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Submitted February 15, 2024  
Decided March 18, 2024

**Before**

DIANE S. SYKES, *Chief Judge*

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*

No. 22-2181

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

*v.*

LEONARD WILLIAMSON, JR.,  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

Appeal from the  
United States District Court for the  
Southern District of Indiana,  
Indianapolis Division.

No. 1:21-CR-00132

James P. Hanlon,  
*Judge.*

**O R D E R**

A jury found Leonard Williamson, Jr., guilty of possessing cocaine with intent to distribute in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1). The same jury acquitted him of carrying a firearm in relation to a drug-trafficking crime in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) and possessing a firearm as a felon in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). Despite the acquittal on the firearm counts, the judge considered the same conduct at sentencing—over Williamson’s objection—and found by a preponderance of the evidence that he possessed a firearm in connection with a drug crime. Based on that finding, the judge applied a two-level enhancement to Williamson’s total offense level under the Sentencing Guidelines. *See* U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1(b)(1).

No. 22-2181

Page 2

The enhancement boosted Williamson's offense level from 12 to 14, yielding an advisory imprisonment range of 33 to 41 months. (Without the enhancement, the range would have been 27 to 33 months.) After weighing the sentencing factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), the judge imposed an above-Guidelines sentence of 57 months in prison.

Williamson's appeal raises a single issue: he argues that the judge's reliance on acquitted conduct to calculate the Guidelines range violated his rights to due process and trial by jury under the Fifth and Sixth Amendments. This argument is foreclosed by *United States v. Watts*, 519 U.S. 148, 157 (1997), as we have repeatedly held, *see, e.g.*, *United States v. Robinson*, 62 F.4th 318, 320–21 (7th Cir. 2023) (collecting cases). Williamson acknowledges as much and explains that he raises the issue here to preserve it for Supreme Court review. He has properly done so. *Robinson*, 62 F.4th at 321 (rejecting the same argument based on *Watts* and noting that the defendant properly preserved the issue for further review).

AFFIRMED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,      )  
                                    )  
                                    )  
Plaintiff,                      )  
                                    )  
                                    )  
                                    )  
vs.                              ) CAUSE NO. 1:21-cr-00132-JPH-MJD-1  
                                    ) Indianapolis, Indiana  
                                    ) June 22, 2022  
LEONARD WILLIAMSON, JR.,      ) 11:04 a.m.  
                                    )  
                                    )  
Defendant.                      )

Before the  
HONORABLE JAMES PATRICK HANLON

TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:      Ms. Pamela S. Domash  
                                    UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
                                    10 West Market Street  
                                    Suite 2100  
                                    Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
                                    pamela.domash@usdoj.gov

FOR THE DEFENDANT:      Mr. Theodore J. Minch  
                                    SOVICH MINCH LLP  
                                    445 North Pennsylvania Street  
                                    Suite 605  
                                    Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
                                    tjminch@sovichminch.com

COURT REPORTER:      Jodie\_Franzen@insd.uscourts.gov

1 reasonable doubt, and we believe that the evidence does prove  
2 by a preponderance that a firearm was possessed and that the  
3 two-level enhancement is appropriate.

4 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.

5 So the enhancement we're talking about is at  
6 paragraph 24, which adds two levels as a specific offense  
7 characteristic, reading as follows: A firearm was possessed.  
8 Pursuant to United States Sentencing Guidelines  
9 Section 2D1.1(b)(1), two levels are added.

10 The text of that provision of the guidelines does, in  
11 fact, provide for an increase of two levels if a dangerous  
12 weapon, including a firearm, was possessed. Application Note  
13 11(a) does read: The enhancement should be applied if the  
14 weapon was present unless it is clearly improbable that the  
15 weapon was connected to the offense.

16 I think we do have a common understanding as to the  
17 applicable law in terms of the Court's ability to rely on  
18 acquitted conduct and I think Mr. Minch has set forth an  
19 accurate understanding of that law and of course that is --  
20 most recently was set forth by the Seventh Circuit, United  
21 States versus McClinton, C-L-I-N-T-O-N, 23 F.4th 732-735,  
22 Seventh Circuit 2022 where the Seventh Circuit did re-affirm  
23 the principle that a jury's verdict of acquitted does not  
24 prevent the sentencing court from considering conduct  
25 underlying the charge so long as that conduct has been proved

1 by a preponderance of the evidence.

2                   Here I certainly appreciate the argument made by the  
3 defense. Ultimately, however, we don't know exactly why the  
4 jury acquitted Mr. Williamson on the two gun counts, Counts 2  
5 and 3, and so the not guilty verdict means only that the jury  
6 found that the Government had not proven the essential elements  
7 of the offenses charged in Counts 2 and 3 beyond a reasonable  
8 doubt.

9                   And as the parties, I think, have alluded to and  
10 agree upon, I consider the evidence from the trial in  
11 evaluating this issue. I hone in on several pieces of  
12 important evidence that I think do support the conclusion that  
13 the enhancement does apply and that the firearm was possessed  
14 applying the preponderance of the evidence standard. Several  
15 pieces of evidence. First, we have the Government's DNA expert  
16 who testified that the DNA sample recovered from the top round  
17 of the bullet in the magazine fit Mr. Williamson's DNA, so that  
18 evidence is set forth in greater detail in the trial  
19 transcript. That in and of itself is strong evidence of  
20 possession.

21                   But secondly, we also have the fact that we know that  
22 the firearm was in the vehicle that Mr. Williamson was driving  
23 and that's based on the facts introduced at the trial, that the  
24 gun fell out of the passenger's side as the passenger exited  
25 the vehicle and the passenger, of course, yelled at the time

1 that the gun was Mr. Williamson's.

2                   Next, there was also evidence introduced at the trial  
3 in the form of text messages showing that Mr. Williamson was  
4 attempting to get a gun just days before his arrest. There is  
5 nothing in those messages that specifically identifies the  
6 specific firearm that was recovered here, that is true, but  
7 they still show that Mr. Williamson had the intent and purpose  
8 to possess a gun around that time.

9                   And I last would note that of course the facts at the  
10 trial established Mr. Williamson had on his person at the time  
11 of his arrest digital scales and approximately \$5,000 of United  
12 States currency. Guns are known as tools of the trade of drug  
13 trafficking and the jury did find Mr. Williamson guilty of  
14 possession with intent to distribute and I think it's  
15 reasonable to infer from all of the facts and circumstances  
16 that he did possess the firearm. Again, I do acknowledge the  
17 reasons for the objections. I would note that even if the  
18 passenger's statement is hearsay, that it is reliable in the  
19 context in which the statement was made here, as shown in the  
20 trial transcript, as the passenger made the statement  
21 immediately after being removed from the vehicle and that does  
22 indicate and connect Mr. Williamson to the gun.

23                   And of course the DNA evidence and the text messages  
24 also support the inference that Mr. Williamson did in fact  
25 possess the gun. I do recognize that the argument, which was

1 made very well by Mr. Minch, that the magazine did not lock  
2 perfectly into the firearm and that the magazine fell out later  
3 when the examiner took the gun out of the evidence envelope,  
4 but the magazine was in the firearm and it did fit, even if it  
5 didn't lock in properly, and there is also no other plausible  
6 explanation for why the magazine was there if not for the  
7 recovered handgun. I also don't find the theory of the DNA  
8 being transferred from somebody else to be a plausible theory  
9 based on these facts.

10 So when I combine all of the facts and all of the  
11 circumstances, I do find by a preponderance of the evidence  
12 that the firearm was possessed by Mr. Williamson here and it is  
13 not clearly improbable that it was connected to the offense, so  
14 the objection is overruled. The enhancement applies.

15 I adopt the findings of the PSR as -- I adopt as my  
16 own findings the facts that are set forth in the presentence  
17 report, and I accept the report for the record under seal. In  
18 the event of any appeal, counsel on appeal will have access to  
19 the sealed report but not the recommendation portion, which  
20 shall remain confidential.

21 The next step here is for me to determine what the  
22 advisory guideline range is. We are using the 2021 version of  
23 the guidelines. And the offense level calculation is set forth  
24 in the report beginning at paragraph 22 on page 6. The base  
25 offense level is 12, and that is based on the converted drug