

No. 23-918

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

RANITO ALLEN,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

**On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Sixth Circuit**

REPLY TO BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

Dustin M. Koenig
Shalini B. Goyal
JONES DAY
325 John H. McConnell
Blvd.
Suite 600
Columbus, OH 43215

Amanda K. Rice
Counsel of Record
JONES DAY
150 W. Jefferson Ave.
Suite 2100
Detroit, MI 48226
(313) 733-3939
arice@jonesday.com

Counsel for Petitioner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ARGUMENT.....	1
CONCLUSION	1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Delligatti v. United States</i> , No. 23-825 (cert granted June 3, 2024)	1

ARGUMENT

On June 3, 2024, this Court granted certiorari in *Delligatti v. United States*, No. 23-825. This petition presents the same question as *Delligatti*. See BIO 9 (“The same argument has been raised in the petition for a writ of certiorari in *Delligatti*[.]”). Contrary to the Government’s submission, see *id.* at 10–12, this case would have been at least a strong a vehicle for answering that question: The Sixth Circuit’s decision relied exclusively on its answer to the Question Presented, see Pet.App.4a–7a, and the Government waived any argument that the plain-error standard applies, see U.S. CA6 Br. 8 (acknowledging that “whether a particular offense satisfies §924(c)(3)(A)” is “review[ed] de novo”). But because this Court has now granted certiorari in *Delligatti*, Mr. Allen agrees that the Court should “hold [this] petition . . . pending the disposition of that case.” BIO 10.

CONCLUSION

The petition should be held pending the Court’s disposition of *Delligatti v. United States*, No. 23-825 (cert granted Jan. 29, 2024).

June 4, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

Dustin M. Koenig
Shalini B. Goyal
JONES DAY
325 John H. McConnell
Blvd.
Suite 600
Columbus, OH 43215

Amanda K. Rice
Counsel of Record
JONES DAY
150 W. Jefferson Ave.
Suite 2100
Detroit, MI 48226
(313) 733-3939
arice@jonesday.com

Counsel for Petitioner