

06-6330 KIMBROUGH V. UNITED STATES

DECISION BELOW: 174 Fed. Appx. 798

LOWER COURT CASE NUMBER: 05-4554

QUESTION PRESENTED:

In *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005), this Court held that mandatory application of the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines violates a criminal defendant's right under the Sixth Amendment to have facts that increase his or her sentence determined by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. The Court further held that to avoid the Sixth Amendment violation, the Guidelines are to be applied as advisory only, and as one of a number of factors both that a sentencing court must consider pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §3553(a) in exercising its discretion in selecting a sentence and that a court of appeals must consider when reviewing the sentence for reasonableness. In light of the Court's holdings, the following questions are presented.

- (1) In carrying out the mandate of §3553(a) to impose a sentence that is "sufficient but not greater than necessary" on a defendant, may a district court consider either the impact of the so-called "100:1 crack/powder ratio" implemented in the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines or the reports and recommendations of the U.S. Sentencing Commission in 1995, 1997, and 2002 regarding the ratio?
- (2) In carrying out the mandate of §3553(a) to impose a sentence that is "sufficient but not greater than necessary" upon a defendant, how is a district court to consider and balance the various factors spelled out in the statute, and in particular, subsection (a)(6), which addresses "the need to avoid unwarranted disparity among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct"?

CERT. GRANTED 6/11/2007