

No. \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

In the Supreme Court of the United States

---

**James Edward Young,**  
*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

---

Taylor Wills Edwards "T.W." Brown  
*Assistant Federal Public Defender*  
Northern District of Texas  
P.O. Box 17743  
819 Taylor Street, Room 9A10  
Fort Worth, TX 76102  
(817) 978-2753  
Taylor\_W\_Brown@fd.org  
Texas Bar No. 24087225

---

---

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- I. Mr. Young pleaded guilty to violating 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1), which criminalizes the possession of a firearm by anyone previously convicted for a felony offense. He then attacked the statute of conviction as unconstitutional on appeal. Applying the plain-error standard of review, the Fifth Circuit declared the error alleged to be insufficiently clear. To support the point, it noted a circuit split on the question of § 922(g)(1)'s constitutionality. That split turns on whether § 922(g)(1) is sufficiently similar to Founding Era surety laws and other laws aimed at disarming groups perceived to be dangerous. Those same arguments are now before the Court in *United States v. Rahimi*, No. 22-915.

The question presented is:

Whether a ruling in Mr. Rahimi's favor would affect the Fifth Circuit's plain-error analysis concerning the constitutionality of § 922(g)(1).

## LIST OF PARTIES

James Edward Young, petitioner on review, was the Defendant-Appellant below. The United States of America, respondent on review, was Plaintiff-Appellee.

No party is a corporation.

## RELATED PROCEEDINGS

- *United States v. James Edward Young*, No. 5:22-CR-029-H, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas. Judgment entered on October 27, 2022.
- *United States v. James Edward Young*, No. 22-11098, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. Judgment entered on May 6, 2024.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... i

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING ..... ii

INDEX TO APPENDICES ..... iii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iv

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI ..... 1

OPINIONS BELOW ..... 1

JURISDICTION..... 1

RELEVANT PROVISIONS ..... 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 2

REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION..... 3

    I.    The Court should hold this petition pending its decision in  
        *United States v. Rahimi* ..... 3

        a. An opinion in Mr. Rahimi’s favor would affect the clarity  
           of the error alleged by Mr. Young..... 4

        b. On plain-error review, the clarity of the error alleged is  
           judged at the time of appellate disposition ..... 5

        c. If the Court rejects the historical analogues proffered by  
           the government in *Rahimi*, it should grant this petition  
           and remand to allow the Fifth Circuit a second look..... 7

CONCLUSION..... 8

**INDEX TO APPENDICES**

Appendix A Judgment and Opinion of Fifth Circuit (Pet.App.a1-a3)

Appendix B Judgment and Sentence of the United States District Court for the  
Northern District of Texas (Pet.App.a4-a11)

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Constitutional Provisions

U.S. CONST., amend. II .....	1
------------------------------	---

### Statutes

18 U.S.C. § 922.....	1
----------------------	---

28 U.S.C. § 1254 .....	1
------------------------	---

### Cases

<i>United States v. Rahimi</i> , No. 22-915, 143 S. Ct. 2688, 2688-89 (June 30, 2023).....	3
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

<i>Maldonado v. United States</i> , 136 S. Ct. 510 (2015) .....	6
-----------------------------------------------------------------	---

<i>Gonzalez v. Thaler</i> , 565 U.S. 134 (2012) .....	5
-------------------------------------------------------	---

<i>Clay v. United States</i> , 537 U.S. 522 (2003).....	5
---------------------------------------------------------	---

<i>Johnson v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 461 (1997).....	5
------------------------------------------------------------	---

<i>United States v. Jones</i> , 88 F.4th 571 (5th Cir. 2023).....	3
-------------------------------------------------------------------	---

<i>United States v. Cunningham</i> , 70 F.4th 502 (8th Cir. 2023) .....	3
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

<i>Range v. Att’y General</i> , 69 F.4th 96 (3d Cir. 2023) ( <i>en banc</i> ) .....	3-4
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

<i>United States v. Jackson</i> , 69 F.4th 495 (8th Cir. 2023).....	5
---------------------------------------------------------------------	---

<i>United States v. Rahimi</i> , 61 F.4th 443 (5th Cir. 2023) .....	3
---------------------------------------------------------------------	---

<i>United States v. Rahimi</i> , 59 F.4th 163 (5th Cir. 2023) .....	3
---------------------------------------------------------------------	---

<i>United States v. Maldonado</i> , 638 F. App’x 360 (5th Cir. 2016) .....	6-7
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

<i>United States v. Maldonado</i> , 608 F. App’x 244 (5th Cir. 2015) .....	6
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

## **PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

James Edward Young respectfully petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment and opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

### **OPINIONS BELOW**

The Fifth Circuit's unreported opinion is available on Westlaw's electronic database at 2024 WL 1994313 and reprinted at Pet.App.a1-a3.

### **JURISDICTION**

The Court of Appeals issued its panel opinion on May 6, 2024. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

### **RELEVANT PROVISIONS**

This Petition involves the offense defined at 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1):

It shall be unlawful for any person . . . who has been convicted in any court of, a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year . . . to ship or transport in interstate or foreign commerce, or possess in or affecting commerce, any firearm or ammunition; or to receive any firearm or ammunition which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce.

This petition also involves the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution:

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

U.S. CONST., amend. II.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Mr. Young pleaded guilty to violating 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). In a one-count indictment, a grand jury in the Northern District of Texas alleged his possession of a firearm following his conviction for “a crime punishable by a term of imprisonment exceeding one year.” Indictment at 1, *United States v. James Edward Young*, Case No. 5:22-CR-029-P (N.D. Tex. Mar. 9, 2022), ECF No. 18. He pleaded guilty to the offense alleged in the one-count indictment, but in the accompanying plea agreement, did not waive his right to appeal. *See* Plea Agreement at 1-6, *United States v. James Edward Young*, Case No. 5:22-CR-029-P (N.D. Tex. May 11, 2022), ECF No. 28. Mr. Young did not raise a Second Amendment challenge to the constitutionality of § 922(g)(1) before the district court.

Mr. Young raised a plain-error Second Amendment claim on appeal. The Founding Era historical context, he argued, undercut § 922(g)(1)’s constitutionality. Appellant’s Initial Brief at 19-21, *United States v. James Edward Young*, Case No. 22-11098 (5th Cir. Feb. 2, 2023), ECF No. 19. His prong-two argument relied on the Fifth Circuit’s recently issued opinion in *United States v. Rahimi*, which declared § 922(g)(8) an unconstitutional infringement on the right to bear arms. *Id.* at 23 (citing 59 F.4th 163 (5th Cir. 2023), *withdrawn and superseded by* 61 F.4th 443 (5th Cir. 2023)). This Court has since granted certiorari in *Rahimi*. *United States v. Rahimi*, No. 22-915, 143 S. Ct. 2688, 2688-89 (June 30, 2023).

Mr. Young lost on plain error’s second prong. The Fifth Circuit, the panel assigned to Mr. Young’s appeal explained in an unpublished opinion, had already

issued a published opinion declaring § 922(g)(1)'s constitutionality unsettled. Pet.App.a3 (citing *United States v. Jones*, 88 F.4th 571, 573-74 (5th Cir. 2023)). That made it impossible for Mr. Young to show clear or obvious error. *Id.* In the published opinion precluding relief, the Fifth Circuit noted the existence a circuit split on § 922(g)'s constitutionality. *Jones*, 88 F.4th at 574 (citing *United States v. Cunningham*, 70 F.4th 502, 506 (8th Cir. 2023); *Range v. Att'y General*, 69 F.4th 96, 98-99 (3d Cir. 2023) (*en banc*)).

### **REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION**

#### **I. The Court should hold this petition pending its decision in *United States v. Rahimi*.**

This Court will soon address the circuit split that precluded plain-error relief below. In *United States v. Rahimi*, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals rejected Founding Era laws aimed at disarming dangerous and disloyal individuals as sufficiently analogous to save § 922(g)(8) against a Second Amendment challenge. 61 F.4th at 457, 459-60. Those arguments are now pending before the Court, and the circuit split on § 922(g)(1) turns on the same basic analysis. An opinion in Mr. Rahimi's favor would therefore affect the claim advanced below and require a second look by the Fifth Circuit as to the clarity of the error alleged. This Court should hold Mr. Young's petition pending *Rahimi*. If it rules in Mr. Rahimi's favor, this Court should then grant the petition, vacate the Fifth Circuit's judgment, and remand for a reconsideration of the error alleged.



**a. An opinion in Mr. Rahimi’s favor would affect the clarity of the error alleged by Mr. Young.**

The pending circuit split depends on the same historical analogues before this Court in *Rahimi*. To defend § 922(g)(8), the government initially referred this Court to English and American laws aimed at disarming individuals thought to be “dangerous.” Brief for the United States at 14-15, 22-24, *United States v. Rahimi*, No. 22-915 (Aug. 14, 2023). It then depicted historical surety laws as within the same tradition of firearm regulation. *Id.* at 24. “Those laws,” the government argued, “confirm that irresponsible individuals were subject to special restrictions that did not (indeed, could not) apply to ordinary, law-abiding citizens.” *Id.* The pending circuit split precluding second-prong relief in this case turns on the analogical value of the same laws. In *Range*, a majority of the *en banc* Third Circuit rejected laws aimed at disarming loyalists and criminalizing the possession of firearms by disfavored minorities as sufficient historical analogues because those laws “do[] nothing to prove that” the individual challenging § 922(g)(1) in that case was “part of a similar group today.” 69 F.4th at 105. A dissenting judge, however, would have rejected the petitioner’s as-applied challenge based on those same laws. *Id.* at 115 (Shwartz, J., dissenting). Section 922(g)(1), he reasoned, simply used the petitioner’s prior felony conviction “as a proxy for disloyalty and disrespect for the sovereign and its laws” in the same way the historical laws cited by the government had relied on loyalty, race, and religion to do the same *Id.* A panel of Eighth Circuit judges recently upheld § 922(g)(1) on similar reasoning and based on the

same historical analogues. *United States v. Jackson*, 69 F.4th 495, 502-06 (8th Cir. 2023).

This Court’s resolution of the broad historical claims advanced by the government in *Rahimi* will necessarily affect the Fifth Circuit’s assessment of the error alleged by Mr. Young. If the government is right, Congress and state legislatures are free to identify groups as dangerous in the abstract and to punish any individual within that group for possessing a firearm. Neither § 922(g)(8) nor § 922(g)(1) offend the Second Amendment if legislative judgment as to abstract risks of danger is the dividing line between constitutional and unconstitutional firearm restrictions. If, however, this Court rejects that level of generality and rules in favor of Mr. Rahimi, the plain-error challenge presented below to § 922(g)(1) deserves a second look. After all, the error alleged was insufficiently obvious only because one circuit court of appeals has adopted an approach to the Second Amendment this Court may well reject in *Rahimi*.

**b. On plain-error review, the clarity of the error alleged is judged at the time of appellate disposition.**

A decision in Mr. Rahimi’s favor would affect the Fifth Circuit’s plain-error analysis in this case. Whether an error is plain depends on the state of the law “at the time of appellate consideration.” *Johnson v. United States*, 520 U.S. 461, 468 (1997). The judgment entered in this case is not yet final. *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 149 (2012) (quoting *Clay v. United States*, 537 U.S. 522, 527 (2003)). An

opinion in Mr. Rahimi's favor would render the Fifth Circuit's second-prong analysis obsolete and require a reassessment of the claim advanced below.

This has happened before. In *Johnson v. United States*, this Court declared the Armed Career Criminal Act's residual clause unconstitutionally vague. 576 U.S. 591, 597 (2015). A district court in the Southern District of Texas had previously imposed an ACCA-enhanced sentence against a defendant named Antonio Maldonado based in part on the residual clause. *United States v. Maldonado*, 638 F. App'x 360, 362 (5th Cir. 2016). The Fifth Circuit initially affirmed the sentence. *United States v. Maldonado*, 608 F. App'x 244, 244 (5th Cir. 2015). This Court then issued its opinion in *Johnson*, granted Mr. Maldonado's petition for certiorari, and vacated the Fifth Circuit's judgment. *Maldonado v. United States*, 136 S. Ct. 510, 511 (2015). Mr. Maldonado had not challenged the district court's application of the residual clause at his sentencing hearing, so the plain-error standard applied. *Maldonado*, 638 F. App'x at 362. The Fifth Circuit nevertheless recognized on remand its duty to reassess Mr. Maldonado's sentence in light of *Johnson*: "The judgment against Maldonado was not final when *Johnson* was decided, and the *Johnson* decision announced law that applies in Maldonado's case." *Id.* The Fifth Circuit declared the district court's error sufficiently clear and reversed on plain-error review. *Id.* at 363.

A ruling in Mr. Rahimi's favor would likewise affect the Fifth Circuit's plain-error analysis in this case. As it stands, the strength of the historical analogues offered by the government to defend both § 922(g)(8) and § 922(g)(1) remains

unsettled. This Court’s opinion in *Rahimi* will resolve that dispute. The arguments advanced by the government to defend both statutes are effectively identical, and a ruling from this Court as to one will affect the other. Since the judgment entered below is not yet final, Mr. Young could take advantage of a ruling in Mr. Rahimi’s favor, and the Fifth Circuit would be obliged to consider that ruling upon remand. *Maldonado*, 638 F. App’x at 362.

**c. If the Court rejects the historical analogues proffered by the government in *Rahimi*, it should grant this petition and remand to allow the Fifth Circuit a second look.**

The Court should hold this petition pending its decision in *United States v. Rahimi*. An opinion in Mr. Rahimi’s favor would affect the clarity of the error alleged by Mr. Young. At that point, the Fifth Circuit’s plain-error analysis would “conflict[] with [a] relevant decision[] of this Court,” and certiorari would be appropriate. Rule 10, RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES. The outcome of this petition thus depends on the outcome of *Rahimi*. If the Court rules in Mr. Rahimi’s favor, it should grant this petition, vacate the Fifth Circuit’s judgment, and remand for a reconsideration of the error alleged below.

## CONCLUSION

Petitioner respectfully submits that this Court should grant *certiorari* to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

Respectfully submitted June 4, 2024.

/s/ Taylor Wills Edwards “T.W.” Brown  
Taylor Wills Edwards “T.W.” Brown  
*Assistant Federal Public Defender*  
Northern District of Texas  
P.O. Box 17743  
819 Taylor Street, Room 9A10  
Fort Worth, TX 76102  
(817) 978-2753  
Taylor\_W\_Brown@fd.org  
Texas Bar No. 24087225

*Attorney for Petitioner*