

CAPITAL CASE

No. 17-A-_____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MICHAEL EUGENE SAMPLE,

Petitioner-Applicant

vs.

STATE OF TENNESSEE

Respondent

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

To The Honorable Elena Kagan, Associate Justice, and Circuit Justice For The United States Court Of Appeals For The Sixth Circuit: In this capital case, Applicant Michael Sample respectfully applies for a sixty (60) day extension of time, to and including April 20, 2018, within which to file a petition for writ of certiorari.

In support of this application, Michael Sample states:

1. This is a capital post-conviction proceeding in which Petitioner has sought application of *Hall v. Florida*, 572 U.S. ____ (2014) to his Eighth Amendment claim that he is intellectually disabled and ineligible for the death penalty.

2. On August 4, 2017, the Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals denied Sample's motion to reopen his post-conviction petition and refused to apply *Hall*, concluding that *Hall* does not apply retroactively. *Sample v. State*, No. W2016-02324-CCA-R28-PD (Tenn. Crim.App. Aug. 4, 2017)(Exhibit 1).

3. Michael Sample sought permission to appeal in the Tennessee Supreme Court, arguing that *Hall v. Florida* is retroactive to his case.

4. On November 21, 2017, the Tennessee Supreme Court denied permission to appeal. Exhibit 2.

5. Michael Sample presently has until February 19, 2018 to file a petition for writ of certiorari. See U.S.S.Ct.R. 13.1.

6. Under Rule 13.5, this Court may extend the time for seeking certiorari for up to sixty (60) additional days. Your Honor should do so under the circumstances.

7. The Court of Criminal Appeals has rejected the retroactivity of *Hall* and refused to find it retroactive under *Montgomery v. Louisiana*, 577 U.S. ____ (2016), having concluded that the retroactivity principles espoused in *Montgomery* “would not, and did not, affect the retroactive application of *Hall* by Tennessee courts.” *Sample*, slip. op. at 3 (Exhibit 1).

8. The Court of Criminal Appeals decision conflicts with *Hall* itself, in which this Court applied its holding retroactively to a post-conviction proceeding.

9. The Court of Criminal Appeals decision also conflicts with *Haliburton v. Florida*, 574 U.S. ____ (2014), in which this Court granted certiorari in a post-conviction case and remanded for reconsideration in light of *Hall*.

10. The Court of Criminal Appeals decision similarly runs counter to *Montgomery*, which itself recognizes that a decision making an intellectually disabled person ineligible for the death sentence is substantive (not procedural) and therefore retroactive. See *Montgomery*, 577 U.S. at ____ (slip op. at 19) (citing *Atkins v. Virginia*, 536 U.S. 304 (2002)).

11. And the Court of Criminal Appeals decision conflicts with various lower court decisions finding *Hall* retroactive. *See e.g., Walls v. State*, 213 So.3d 340 (Fla. 2016); *White v. Commonwealth*, 500 S.W.3d 208, 214-215 (Ky. 2016)

12. Michael Sample's petition for writ of certiorari, therefore, will present significant issues worthy of this Court's review, including, for example: (a) Does *Hall v. Florida*, 572 U.S. ____ (2014) apply retroactively in post-conviction proceedings? and (b) Does *Montgomery v. Louisiana*, 577 U.S. ____ (2016) require the retroactive application of *Hall*?

13. In this capital case, Your Honor should therefore grant Michael Sample a sixty (60) day extension of time, to and including May 21, 2018, within which to file a petition for writ of certiorari. Petitioner requires this additional time where undersigned counsel has had to attend to other responsibilities, including, for example, the filing of a petition for writ of certiorari in *Porter v. Genovese*, U.S. No. 17-7595 (filed Jan. 25, 2018), the preparation of a court of appeals brief in the capital case of *Hall v. Mays*, 6th Cir. Nos. 10-5658, 15-5436 (brief due Feb. 26, 2018), and preparation for a District Court hearing in *Guerrero v. Donahue*, M.D.Tenn. No. 1:14-cv-00151 (hearing scheduled Feb. 27, 2018).

14. Your Honor has previously granted similar extensions of time in intellectual disability cases involving questions about the retroactivity of *Hall*. *See e.g., Chalmers v. Tennessee*, U.S. No. 17A184 (Aug. 16, 2017)(Kagan, J.)(granting 60-day extension); *Payne v. State*, U.S. No. 16A100 (July 19, 2016)(Kagan, J.)(granting 60-day extension).

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Your Honor should grant a 60-day extension, up to and including April 20, 2018, within which to file a petition for writ of certiorari.

Respectfully Submitted,



Paul R. Bottei
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Office of the Federal Public Defender
Middle District of Tennessee
810 Broadway, Suite 200
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(615) 736-5047

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of this application was served upon counsel for Respondent, James Gaylord, P. O. Box 20207, Nashville, Tennessee 37202 this the 8th day of February, 2018.



Paul R. Bottei