No. 25-6285

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

RUDY ALTAMIRANO, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

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

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

D. JOHN SAUER
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov
(202) 514-2217

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 25-6285

RUDY ALTAMIRANO, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

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

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

Petitioner contends (Pet. 26-33) that 18 U.S.C. 922(g)(1) violates the Second Amendment on its face and as applied to him. For the reasons set out in the government's brief opposing certiorari in French v. United States, 145 S. Ct. 2709 (2025), the contention that Section 922(g)(1) is facially unconstitutional does not warrant this Court's review. See ibid. (denying certiorari). As the government explained in French, that contention plainly lacks merit, and every court of appeals to consider the issue since United States v. Rahimi, 602 U.S. 680 (2024), has determined that the statute has at least some valid

applications. See Br. in Opp. at 3-6, French, supra (No. 24-6623).

Similarly, for the reasons set out in the government's brief opposing certiorari in Vincent v. Bondi, No. 24-1155 (Aug. 11, 2025), the contention that Section 922(g)(1) violates the Second Amendment as applied to petitioner does not warrant this Court's review. Although there is some disagreement among the courts of appeals regarding whether Section 922(g)(1) is susceptible to individualized as-applied challenges, that disagreement is shallow. See Br. in Opp. at 11-14, Vincent, supra (No. 24-1155). This Court has previously denied plenary review when faced with similarly narrow disagreements among the circuits about the availability of as-applied challenges to Section 922(g)(1). See id. at 13-14. And any disagreement among the circuits may evaporate given the Department of Justice's recent reestablishment of the administrative process under 18 U.S.C. 925(c) for granting relief from federal firearms disabilities. See Br. in Opp. at 8-11, Vincent, supra (No. 24-1155).

Moreover, Section 922(g)(1) does not raise any constitutional concerns as applied to petitioner. Petitioner possessed a firearm in this case after sustaining felony convictions for theft of a firearm and possession of a controlled substance, and he was arrested in this case in possession of a firearm while drug trafficking. Presentence Investigation Report ¶¶ 10-11, 32, 34; Pet. App. 1a. Given his criminal history, petitioner cannot show

that he would prevail on an as-applied challenge in any circuit. See, e.g., United States v. White, No. 23-3013, 2025 WL 384112, at *2 (3d Cir. Feb. 4, 2025) (rejecting an as-applied challenge brought by a felon with previous conviction for, inter alia, carrying a firearm without a license), cert. denied, 145 S. Ct. 2805 (2025); United States v. Morgan, 147 F.4th 522, 528 (5th Cir. 2025) (rejecting an as-applied challenge by a felon with a prior state felony conviction for illegal use of weapons); Pitsilides v. Barr, 128 F.4th 203, 213 (3d Cir. 2025) (district courts may consider "the context and circumstances" of a previous offense in deciding an as-applied challenge to Section 922(g)(3)).

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.*

Respectfully submitted.

D. JOHN SAUER
Solicitor General

FEBRUARY 2026

* Copies of the government's briefs in opposition in French and Vincent are being served on petitioner. The government waives any further response to the petition for a writ of certiorari unless this Court requests otherwise.