

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

Maurice Coleman,
Petitioner,

v.

United States of America,
Respondent

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Loui Itoh
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Northern District of Texas
PO Box 17743
819 Taylor Street Room 9A10
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(817) 978-2753
Loui_Itoh@fd.org

Counsel for Petitioner

QUESTION PRESENTED

Does 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g) comport with the Fifth and Sixth Amendments?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner is Maurice Coleman, who was the Defendant-Appellant in the court below. Respondent, the United States of America, was the Plaintiff-Appellee in the court below.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

- *United States v. Coleman*, No. 4:18-CR-00059-P, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas. Judgment entered on September 15, 2025.
- *United States v. Coleman*, No. 25-11068, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Judgment entered on April 13, 2026.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED	i
Does 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g) comport with the Fifth and Sixth Amendments?.....	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING.....	ii
RELATED PROCEEDINGS.....	iii
INDEX TO APPENDICES	v
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	vi
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
OPINION BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
RELEVANT PROVISIONS.....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	3
REASON FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION	5
CONCLUSION.....	8

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix A Opinion of Fifth Circuit (Pet. App. A)

Appendix B Judgment and Sentence of the United States District Court for the
Northern District of Texas (Pet. App. B)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alleyne v. United States</i> , 570 U.S. 99 (2013)	5
<i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> , 530 U.S. 466 (2000)	5, 6
<i>Blakely v. Washington</i> , 542 U.S. 296 (2004)	6
<i>Borden v. United States</i> , 593 U.S. 420 (2021)	6
<i>Henderson v. United States</i> , 568 U.S. 266 (2013)	7
<i>Lawrence on behalf of Lawrence v. Chater</i> 516 U.S. 163 (1996)	7
<i>Stutson v. United States</i> , 516 U.S. 163 (1996)	7
<i>United States v. Booker</i> , 543 U.S. 220 (2005)	6
<i>United States v. Castleman</i> , 572 U.S. 157 (2014)	6
<i>United States v. Coleman</i> , No. 25-11068, 2026 WL 989076 (5th Cir. Apr. 13, 2026)	1, 4
<i>United States v. Garner</i> , 969 F.3d 550 (5th Cir. 2020)	4
<i>United States v. Haymond</i> , 588 U.S. 634 (2019)	4, 5, 6, 7
<i>United States v. Olano</i> , 507 U.S. 725 (1993)	7

<i>Voisine v. United States</i> , 579 U.S. 686 (2016)	6
--	---

Statutes

18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)	1, 4, 5, 6
18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)(1)	4, 5
18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)(2)	4
18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)(3)	5
18 U.S.C. § 3583(k)	5, 6
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)	1

Constitutional Provisions

United States Constitution Fifth Amendment.....	2, 4, 5, 6
United States Constitution Sixth Amendment	2, 4, 5, 6

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner Maurice Coleman seeks a writ of certiorari to review the judgment and opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

OPINION BELOW

The Fifth Circuit's unreported opinion is available at *United States v. Coleman*, No. 25-11068, 2026 WL 989076 (5th Cir. Apr. 13, 2026)(unpublished). It is reprinted as Appendix A to this Petition. The district court's judgment is attached as Appendix B.

JURISDICTION

The panel opinion and judgment of the Fifth Circuit were entered on April 13, 2026. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

RELEVANT PROVISIONS

This Petition involves 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g), which states:

(g) Mandatory Revocation for Possession of Controlled Substance or Firearm or for Refusal To Comply With Drug Testing.—If the defendant—

(1) possesses a controlled substance in violation of the condition set forth in subsection (d);

(2) possesses a firearm, as such term is defined in section 921 of this title, in violation of Federal law, or otherwise violates a condition of supervised release prohibiting the defendant from possessing a firearm;

(3) refuses to comply with drug testing imposed as a condition of supervised release; or

(4) as a part of drug testing, tests positive for illegal controlled substances more than 3 times over the course of 1 year;

the court shall revoke the term of supervised release and require the defendant to serve a term of imprisonment not to exceed the maximum term of imprisonment authorized under subsection (e)(3).

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

The Sixth Amendment provides:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Facts and District Court Proceedings

Petitioner Maurice Coleman was convicted of Felon in Possession of a Firearm and sentenced to 46 months of imprisonment, followed by 3 years of supervised release. Record in the Court of Appeals 13.

On November 9, 2018, the district court revoked his supervised release and sentenced him to 24 months of imprisonment to be followed by 12 months of supervised release. Record in the Court of Appeals 68-72.

On April 8, 2021, the district court revoked his supervised release a second time and sentenced him to time served followed by 6 months of supervised release. ROA.97-100.

On July 31, 2021, Mr. Coleman was arrested in Omaha, Nebraska on state charges. Record in the Court of Appeals 137. On March 8, 2022, he pleaded guilty to Operating Motor Vehicle to Avoid Arrest Willful Reckless Driving (Count 1), and Possession of Deadly Weapon by Prohibited Person (Count 2) in the District Court of Douglas County, Nebraska. Record in the Court of Appeals 137.

On August 27, 2025, Probation filed a Third Amended Petition for Person Under Supervision alleging that Mr. Coleman had violated his supervised release by: testing positive for marijuana (paragraph I), being arrested on April 14, 2021 for assaulting his pregnant girlfriend (paragraph II), and leaving the jurisdiction without permission, possessing a firearm, and committing the offenses he pled guilty to in Nebraska (paragraph III). ROA.135-140.

The Petition also stated that the judge was required to revoke the term of release by 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)(1) and (g)(2). Record in the Court of Appeals 139. Those provisions make revocation mandatory when a releasee possesses a controlled substance or a firearm. Record in the Court of Appeals 139.

At the final revocation hearing, Mr. Coleman pled true to the allegations in the third paragraph of the Third Amended Petition. Record in the Court of Appeals 147. The court granted the government's motion to dismiss paragraphs I and II. Record in the Court of Appeals 147. The district court revoked his supervised release and sentenced him to 18 months' imprisonment with no supervised release to follow. Record in the Court of Appeals 147-148.

B. Proceedings on Appeal

Mr. Coleman appealed, arguing that the district court erred in applying the mandatory revocation provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g), because those provisions violate the Fifth and Sixth Amendments under the rationale of *United States v. Haymond*, 588 U.S. 634 (2019). *See United States v. Coleman*, No. 25-11068, 2026 WL 989076 at *1 (5th Cir. Apr. 13, 2026)(unpublished). He acknowledged that his claim was foreclosed by circuit precedent, *see id.* (citing *United States v. Garner*, 969 F.3d 550 (5th Cir. 2020)), and the Court of Appeals affirmed, *see id.*

REASON FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION

- I. This Court should hold the instant Petition pending any plenary grant of certiorari addressing the question presented, which was reserved by the plurality in *United States v. Haymond*, 588 U.S. 634 (2019).

- A. This case presents an unaddressed question from *Haymond* regarding the continued viability of the mandatory revocation statute of 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g).

The Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the United States Constitution require that any fact that increases the defendant's maximum or minimum range of punishment be proven to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. *See Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000); *Alleyne v. United States*, 570 U.S. 99 (2013). Sections 3583(g)(1) and (g)(2) of Title 18 compel the district court to impose a term of imprisonment when a defendant on supervised release possesses a controlled substance or a firearm. A straightforward application of *Alleyne*, therefore, would tend to show that the relevant fact must be proven to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt.

In *United States v. Haymond*, 588 U.S. 634 (2019), the Court addressed the constitutionality of 18 U.S.C. § 3583(k), which requires revocation and a five-year term of imprisonment when sex offenders on supervised release commit a new specified sex offense. A plurality of the Court found that the provision violates the jury trial guarantee of the Sixth Amendment, though they did not join a common opinion. *See Haymond*, 588 U.S. at 656 (Gorsuch, J., plurality op.); *Haymond*, 588 U.S. at 658 (Breyer, J., concurring).

A four-Justice plurality expressly reserved the question at issue in this case: whether 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g) violates the Fifth and Sixth Amendments:

Just as we have no occasion to decide whether § 3583(k) implicates *Apprendi* by raising the ceiling of permissible punishments beyond those authorized by the jury’s verdict, *see* n. 4, *supra*, we do not pass judgment one way or the other on § 3583(e)’s consistency with *Apprendi*. Nor do we express a view on the mandatory revocation provision for certain drug and gun violations in § 3583(g), which requires courts to impose “a term of imprisonment” of unspecified length.

Haymond, 588 U.S. at 652 n.7 (Gorsuch, J.)(plurality op.). Such reservations have previously foreshadowed grants of certiorari on the reserved issue, often promptly. Compare *Blakely v. Washington*, 542 U.S. 296, 305 n.9 (2004)(“The Federal Guidelines are not before us, and we express no opinion on them.”) with *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005)(rendering a holding on this question); compare *Voisine v. United States*, 579 U.S. 686, 694 n.4 (2016)(“Like *Leocal*, our decision today concerning § 921(a)(33)(A)’s scope does not resolve whether § 16 includes reckless behavior.”) with *Borden v. United States*, 593 U.S. 420 (2021)(rendering a holding on the question); *see also Voisine*, 579 U.S. at 689 (“ . . . we expressly left open whether a reckless assault also qualifies as a ‘use’ of force—so that a misdemeanor conviction for such conduct would trigger § 922(g)(9)’s firearms ban. . . . The two cases before us now raise that issue.”)(internal citations omitted)(citing *United States v. Castleman*, 572 U.S. 157, 169 n.8 (2014)).

B. This Court should grant certiorari to address the issue in another case, and hold the instant Petition pending the outcome.

This Court should grant certiorari to decide this momentous issue, and, if it does so in another case, should hold the instant Petition pending the outcome. *See Stutson v. United States*, 516 U.S. 163, 181 (1996) (Scalia, J., dissenting) (“We regularly hold cases that involve the same issue as a case on which certiorari has been granted and plenary review is being conducted *in order that* (if appropriate) they may be ‘GVR’d’ when the case is decided.”) (emphasis in original).

This is so notwithstanding the failure of preservation in the district court, which may ultimately occasion review for plain error. *See United States v. Olano*, 507 U.S. 725, 732 (1993). An error may become “plain” any time while the case remains on direct appeal. *See Henderson v. United States*, 568 U.S. 266 (2013).

Accordingly, Petitioner requests that the Court hold his petition pending any case that presents the issue reserved in *Haymond*, and then grant the petition, vacate the judgment below, and remand for reconsideration. *See Lawrence on behalf of Lawrence v. Chater*, 516 U.S. 163 (1996).

CONCLUSION

Petitioner asks this Court to grant certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Respectfully submitted this 13th day of July, 2026.

JASON D. HAWKINS
Federal Public Defender
Northern District of Texas

/s/ Loui Itoh
Loui Itoh
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Northern District of Texas
PO Box 17743
819 Taylor Street Room 9A10
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(817) 978-2753
Loui_Itoh@fd.org

Counsel for Petitioner