

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

Omar Villarreal,
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 Omar Villarreal, 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. Villarreal*, No. 2:17-CR-64-Z-BR-1, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas. Judgment entered on December 12, 2025.
- *United States v. Villarreal*, No. 25-11350, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Judgment entered on June 10, 2026.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING	ii
DIRECTLY RELATED PROCEEDINGS	iii
INDEX TO APPENDICES	v
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vi
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI.....	1
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
STATUTORY 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. 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>United States v. Villarreal</i> , No. 25-11350, 2026 WL 1679029 (5th Cir. June 10, 2026)	1, 4

<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)	5
18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)(3)	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 Omar Villarreal 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. Villarreal*, No. 25-11350, 2026 WL 1679029 (5th Cir. June 10, 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 June 10, 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 Omar Villarreal was convicted of Possession with Intent to Distribute Methamphetamine and sentenced to 120 months of imprisonment, followed by 5 years of supervised release. Record in the Court of Appeals 49-55.

On October 3, 2025, Probation filed a Petition for Person Under Supervision notifying the court that Petitioner had violated his supervised release by *inter alia* failing to submit to drug testing, in violation of a Special Condition requiring him to participate in a drug treatment program, submit to drug testing, and abstain from the use of alcohol and all other intoxicants during and after completing treatment. Record in the Court of Appeals 56-57. The Petition contained a section titled “Mandatory Revocation Statutes” stating: “Mandatory revocation for refusal to comply with drug testing. Sentence to a term of imprisonment.” Record in the Court of Appeals 57 (citing 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g)(3)).

On October 7, 2025, the government filed a Motion to Revoke Supervised Release echoing the Petition’s allegations that Petitioner had violated the Special Condition requiring him to participate in a drug testing and treatment program. Record in the Court of Appeals 60-61.

At his revocation hearing, Petitioner pled true to the violations alleged in the government’s Motion to Revoke Supervised Release. Record in the Court of Appeals 113-114. The district court revoked his supervised release and sentenced him to 7 months of imprisonment, to be followed by 3 years “minus [the] current revocation

sentence” which equates to 2 years and 5 months of supervised release. Record in the Court of Appeals 91-102.

B. Proceedings on Appeal

Petitioner 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. Villarreal*, No. 25-11350, 2026 WL 1679029 at *1 (5th Cir. June 10, 2026) (unpublished). He acknowledged that his claim was foreclosed by circuit precedent, and the Court of Appeals affirmed. *Id.* (citing *United States v. Garner*, 969 F.3d 550, 551–53 (5th Cir. 2020)).

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). Section 3583(g)(3) of Title 18 compels the district court to impose a term of imprisonment when a defendant on supervised release refuses to comply with drug testing imposed as a condition of supervised release. 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. *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 8th day of September, 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