

No. _____

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

Jose Antonio Campos-Esqueda,

,

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

Christy Martin
Assistant Federal Public Defender

Federal Public Defender's Office
Northern District of Texas
525 S. Griffin Street, Suite 629
Dallas, TX 75202
(214) 767-2746
christy_martin@fd.org

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- I. Whether 18 U.S.C. §922(g)(1) comports with the Second Amendment?

- II. Whether 18 U.S.C. §922(g) permits conviction for the possession of any firearm that has ever crossed state lines at any time in the indefinite past, and, if so, if it is facially unconstitutional?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner is Jose Antonio Campos-Esqueda, who was the Defendant-Appellant in the court below. Respondent, the United States of America, was the Plaintiff-Appellee in the court below.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED **i**

 I. Whether 18 U.S.C. §922(g)(1) comports with the Second Amendment?..... i

 II. Whether 18 U.S.C. §922(g) permits conviction for the possession of any
firearm that has ever crossed state lines at any time in the indefinite past, and, if
so, if it is facially unconstitutional?..... i

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING **ii**

INDEX TO APPENDICES **iv**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES **v**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI **1**

OPINION BELOW..... **1**

JURISDICTION **1**

RELEVANT STATUTE AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION **1**

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... **3**

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION..... **4**

 I. This Court should decide the constitutionality of 18 U.S.C. §922(g)(1) under
the Second Amendment. It should hold the instant Petition pending resolution of
any merits cases presenting that issue.4

 II. This Court should grant certiorari to resolve the tension between
Scarborough v. United States, 431 U.S. 563 (1963) on the one hand, and *Nat’l*
Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius, 567 U.S. 519 (2012) and *Bond v. United States*,
572 U.S. 844 (2014) on the other.8

CONCLUSION **15**

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix A Opinion of Fifth Circuit

Appendix B Judgment and Sentence of the United States District Court for the
Northern District of Texas

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>Bond v. United States</i> , 572 U.S. 844 (2014)	8, 9, 13, 14
<i>Florida v. Burr</i> , 496 U.S. 914 (1990)	7
<i>Gibbons v. Ogden</i> , 22 U.S. 1, 9 Wheat. 1 (1824).....	11
<i>Henderson v. United States</i> , 568 U.S. 266 (2013)	7
<i>Henry v. Rock Hill</i> , 376 U.S. 776 (1964)(per curiam)	7
<i>Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius</i> , 567 U.S. 519 (2012)	8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
<i>New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass’n, Inc. v. Bruen</i> , 597 U.S. 1, 142 S. Ct. 2111 (2022)	4
<i>Scarborough v. United States</i> , 431 U.S. 563 (1963)	8, 9, 10, 13
<i>State Farm Mutual Auto Ins. Co. v. Duel</i> , 324 U.S. 154 (1945)	8
<i>Stutson v. United States</i> , 516 U.S. 163 (1996)	7
<i>Torres- Valencia v. United States</i> , 464 U.S. 44 (1983)(per curiam)	7
<i>United States v. Bullock</i> , 679 F.Supp.3d 501 (S.D. Miss. 2023).....	5
<i>United States v. Darby</i> , 312 U.S. 100 (1941)	9
<i>United States v. Moore</i> , 666 F.3d 313 (4th Cir. 2012)	4

<i>United States v. Morrison</i> , 529 U.S. 598 (2000)	9
<i>United States v. Olano</i> , 507 U.S. 725 (1993)	7
<i>United States v. Rahimi</i> , 144 S.Ct. 1889 (June 21, 2024)	4, 5, 6, 7
<i>United States v. Campos-Esqueda</i> , No. 24-10060, 2024 WL 3158616 (5th Cir. June 25, 2024)(unpublished).....	1, 3
<i>Wickard v. Filburn</i> , 317 U.S. 111 (1942)	11
Federal Statutes	
18 U.S.C. § 229.....	13
18 U.S.C. § 229(a)	13, 14
18 U.S.C. § 229F(8)(A).....	13
18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1)	3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15
18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(8)	4, 5
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)	1
Affordable Care Act	10
Constitutional Provisions	
U.S. Const. amend. II	1, 3, 4, 5
U.S.Const. Art. I, § 8.....	1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
Other Authorities	
Adam Winkler, <i>Heller’s Catch-22</i> , 56 UCLA L. Rev. 1551, 1563 (2009)	5
C. Kevin Marshall, <i>Why Can’t Martha Stewart Have A Gun?</i> , 32 Harv. J. L. & Pub. Pol’y 695, 708 (2009).....	5
Carlton F.W. Larson, <i>Four Exceptions in Search of A Theory</i> : District of Columbia v. Heller and Judicial Ipse Dixit, 60 Hastings L. J. 1371, 1376 (2009)	5

Supplemental Brief for the Federal Parties, Nos. 23-374, *Garland v. Range*; 23-683, *Vincent v. Garland*; 23-6170, *Jackson v. United States*; 23-6602, *Cunningham v. United States*; 23-6842, *Doss v. United States*, at p.4, n.1 (June 24, 2024) 6

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner Jose Antonio Campos-Esqueda, seeks a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

OPINION BELOW

The unpublished opinion of the court of appeals is reported at *United States v. Campos-Esqueda*, No. 24-10060, 2024 WL 3158616 (5th Cir. June 25, 2024)(unpublished). It is reprinted in Appendix A to this Petition. The district court's judgment and sentence is attached as Appendix B.

JURISDICTION

The panel opinion and judgment of the Fifth Circuit were entered on June 25, 2024. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1254(1).

RELEVANT STATUTE AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION

Section 922(g) of Title 18 reads in relevant part:

It shall be unlawful for any person—

(1) 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.

The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution provides:

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.

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution provides in relevant part:

The Congress shall have Power

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States,
and with the Indian Tribes...

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Facts and Proceedings in District Court

Petitioner Jose Antonio Campos-Esqueda pleaded guilty to an information charging him with having a prior felony conviction, knowing that he had such a conviction, and possessing a firearm in and affecting commerce, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). The factual basis in support of the plea set forth the elements of the offense, including, as pertinent here, that the firearm possessed “had travelled at some time from one state to another or between any part of the United States and any other country.” See *United States v. Campos-Esqueda*, No. 4:23-cr-0267-P (N.D. Tx.), Factual Resume, D.E. 16. The court accepted the plea.

B. Appellate Proceedings

Petitioner appealed, arguing, inter alia, that he had a Second Amendment right to possess arms, and that a criminal conviction could not lie for the exercise of that right. He further argued that the jurisdictional element of 18 U.S.C. §922(g)(1) requires more than the mere fact of interstate travel, and if not, the statute exceeds Congress’s authority under the Commerce Clause because it lacks a sufficient nexus to activity in interstate commerce.

The court of appeals affirmed. See Pet.App.A. It applied plain error review and found his claims foreclosed by circuit precedent. *Campos-Esqueda*, 2024 WL 3158616, at *1 (citing *United States v. Perryman*, 965 F.3d 424, 426 (5th Cir. 2020); *United States v. Jones*, 88 F.4th 571, 573–74 (5th Cir. 2023) (per curiam)).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

- I. This Court should decide the constitutionality of 18 U.S.C. §922(g)(1) under the Second Amendment. It should hold the instant Petition pending resolution of any merits cases presenting that issue.**

The Second Amendment guarantees “the right of the people to keep and bear arms.” Yet 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) denies that right, on pain of 15 years imprisonment, to anyone previously convicted of a crime punishable by a year or more. In spite of this facial conflict between the statute and the text of the constitution, the courts of appeals uniformly rejected Second Amendment challenges to the statute for many years. *See United States v. Moore*, 666 F.3d 313, 316-317 (4th Cir. 2012) (collecting cases). This changed, however, following *New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass’n, Inc. v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. 1, 142 S. Ct. 2111 (2022). *Bruen* held that where the text of the Second Amendment plainly covers regulated conduct, the government may defend that regulation only by showing that it comports with the nation’s historical tradition of gun regulation. *See Bruen*, 142 S. Ct. at 2129-2130. It may no longer defend the regulation by showing that the regulation achieves an important or even compelling state interest. *See id.* at 2127-2128.

In *United States v. Rahimi*, 144 S.Ct. 1889 (June 21, 2024), this Court held that 18 U.S.C. §922(g)(8) comports with the Second Amendment. That statute makes it a crime to possess a firearm during the limited time that one:

is subject to a court order that ... restrains such person from harassing, stalking, or threatening an intimate partner of such person or child of such intimate partner or person, or engaging in other conduct that would place an intimate partner in reasonable fear of bodily injury to the partner or child; and ... includes a finding that such person

represents a credible threat to the physical safety of such intimate partner or child; orby its terms explicitly prohibits the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against such intimate partner or child that would reasonably be expected to cause bodily injury...

18 U.S.C. §922(g)(8).

Upholding this statute, this Court emphasized its limited holding, which was “only this: An individual found by a court to pose a credible threat to the physical safety of another may be temporarily disarmed consistent with the Second Amendment.” *Rahimi*, 144 S.Ct. at 1903. That rationale plainly leaves ample space to challenge 18 U.S.C. §922(g)(1). Section (g)(1) imposes a permanent, not a temporary, firearm disability. And that disability can arise from all manner of criminal convictions that do not involve a judicial finding of future physical dangerousness.

Such a challenge could well be resolved against constitutionality of §922(g)(1). “Though recognizing the hazard of trying to prove a negative, one can with a good degree of confidence say that bans on convicts possessing firearms were un-known before World War I.” C. Kevin Marshall, *Why Can't Martha Stewart Have A Gun?*, 32 Harv. J. L. & Pub. Pol'y 695, 708 (2009); *see also* Adam Winkler, *Heller's Catch-22*, 56 UCLA L. Rev. 1551, 1563 (2009) (“The Founding generation had no laws . . . denying the right to people convicted of crimes.”); Carlton F.W. Larson, *Four Exceptions in Search of A Theory: District of Columbia v. Heller and Judicial Ipe Dixit*, 60 Hastings L. J. 1371, 1376 (2009)(“...state laws prohibiting felons from possessing firearms or denying firearms licenses to felons date from the early part of the twentieth century.”); *United States v. Bullock*, 679 F.Supp.3d 501, 505 (S.D. Miss.

2023)(“The government's brief in this case does not identify a ‘well-established and representative historical analogue’ from either era supporting the categorical disarmament of tens of millions of Americans who seek to keep firearms in their home for self-defense.”), appeal pending No. 23-60408 .

As the government noted in a recent Supplemental Brief urging this Court to grant certiorari regarding §922(g)(1), many district courts have invalidated the statute even as to defendants with extremely serious felony records. See Supplemental Brief for the Federal Parties in Nos. 23-374, *Garland v. Range*; 23-683, *Vincent v. Garland*; 23-6170, *Jackson v. United States*; 23-6602, *Cunningham v. United States*, and 23-6842, *Doss v. United States*, at p.4, n.1 (June 24, 2024)(collecting 12 such cases)(hereafter “Supplemental Federal Parties”).¹

As noted, the government has now asked this Court to grant certiorari in a wide range of cases presenting the constitutionality of §922(g)(1). All of those Petitions were granted, and the cases remanded in light of *Rahimi, supra*. See *Garland v. Range*, No. 23-374, 2024 WL 3259661 (July 2, 2024); *Vincent v. Garland*, No. 23-6170, 2024 WL 3259668 (July 2, 2024); *Jackson v. United States*, No. 23-6170, 2024 WL 3259675 (July 2, 2024); *Cunningham v. United States*, No. 23-6602, 2024 WL 3259687 (July 2, 2024); *Doss v. United States*, No. 23-6842, 2024 WL 3259684 (July 2, 2024). Notably, this Court remanded both those cases that resulted in a

¹Available at https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/23/23-374/315629/20240624205559866_23-374%20Supp%20Brief.pdf, last visited August 13, 2024.

finding of 922(g)(1)'s unconstitutionality (like *Range*), and those that found it constitutional, (the remainder). This demonstrates that *Rahimi* does not clearly resolve the constitutional status of the statute – were that so, it would be unnecessary to remand those cases in which the arms-bearer lost in the court of appeals. 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.”).

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). For one, an error may become “plain” any time while the case remains on direct appeal. *See Henderson v. United States*, 568 U.S. 266 (2013). Further, procedural obstacles to reversal – such as the consequences of non-preservation – should be decided in the first instance by the court of appeals. *See Henry v. Rock Hill*, 376 U.S. 776, 777 (1964)(per curiam)(GVR “has been our practice in analogous situations where, not certain that the case was free from all obstacles to reversal on an intervening precedent”); *Torres- Valencia v. United States*, 464 U.S. 44 (1983)(per curiam)(GVR utilized over government’s objection where error was conceded; government’s harmless error argument should be presented to the court of appeals in the first instance); *Florida v. Burr*, 496 U.S. 914, 916-919 (1990)(Stevens,

J., dissenting)(speaking approvingly of a prior GVR in the same case, wherein the Court remanded the case for reconsideration in light of a new precedent, although the claim recognized by the new precedent had not been presented below); *State Farm Mutual Auto Ins. Co. v. Duel*, 324 U.S. 154, 161 (1945)(remanding for reconsideration in light of new authority that party lacked opportunity to raise because it supervened the opinion of the court of appeals).

II. This Court should grant certiorari to resolve the tension between *Scarborough v. United States*, 431 U.S. 563 (1963) on the one hand, and *Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519 (2012) and *Bond v. United States*, 572 U.S. 844 (2014) on the other.

Courts have held for years that the mere travel across state lines at any point in time is sufficient to find that later possession of a firearm affected interstate commerce. These cases follow from this Court’s jurisprudence in *Scarborough v. United States*, 431 U.S. 563, 577 (1963), finding federal commerce authority over items that at any point moved across state lines. These cases stand in tension with more recent precedents on the scope of Commerce Clause authority, that is *Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519 (2012) (“*NFIB*”) and *Bond v. United States*, 572 U.S. 844 (2014).

Because *Scarborough* cannot be reconciled with these more recent precedents this Court should grant review to resolve that tension. “In our federal system, the National Government possesses only limited powers; the States and the people retain the remainder.” *Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519, 533 (2012). Powers outside those explicitly enumerated by the Constitution are denied to the National Government. *See Id.* at 534 (“The Constitution’s express conferral of some

powers makes clear that it does not grant others.”) There is no general federal police power. *See United States v. Morrison*, 529 U.S. 598, 618-619 (2000). Every exercise of Congressional power must be justified by reference to a particular grant of authority. *See Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus.*, 567 U.S. at 535 (“The Federal Government has expanded dramatically over the past two centuries, but it still must show that a constitutional grant of power authorizes each of its actions.”). A limited central government promotes accountability and “protects the liberty of the individual from arbitrary power.” *Bond v. United States*, 572 U.S. 844, 863 (2011).

The Constitution grants Congress a power to “regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.” Art. I, § 8, cl. 3. But this power “must be read carefully to avoid creating a general federal authority akin to the police power.” *Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus.*, 567 U.S. at 536. Notwithstanding these limitations, and the text of Article I, Section 8, this Court has held that “[t]he power of Congress over interstate commerce is not confined to the regulation of commerce among the states,” and includes a power to regulate activities that “have a substantial effect on interstate commerce.” *United States v. Darby*, 312 U.S. 100, 118-119 (1941). Relying on this expansive vision of Congressional power, this Court held in *Scarborough v. United States*, 431 U.S. 563 (1963), that a predecessor statute to 18 U.S.C. §922(g) reached every case in which a felon possessed firearms that had once moved in interstate commerce. It turned away concerns of lenity and federalism, finding that Congress had intended the interstate nexus requirement only as a means to insure the constitutionality of the statute. *See Scarborough*, 431 U.S. at 577.

It is difficult to square *Scarborough*, and the expansive concept of the commerce power upon which it relies, with more recent holdings of the Court in this area. In *Nat'l Fed'n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519 (2012), five members of this Court found that the individual mandate component of the Affordable Care Act could not be justified by reference to the Commerce Clause. *See Nat'l Fed'n of Indep. Bus.*, 567 U.S. at 557-558 (Roberts., C.J. concurring). Although the Court recognized that the failure to purchase health insurance affects interstate commerce, five Justices did not think that the constitutional phrase “regulate Commerce ... among the several States,” could reasonably be construed to include enactments that compelled individuals to engage in commerce. *See id.* at 550 (Roberts., C.J. concurring). Rather, they understood that phrase to presuppose an existing commercial activity to be regulated. *See id.* (Roberts., C.J. concurring).

The majority of this Court in *NFIB* thus required more than a demonstrable effect on commerce: the majority required that the challenged enactment itself be a regulation of commerce – that it affect the legality of pre-existing commercial activity. Possession of firearms, like the refusal to purchase health insurance, may “substantially affect commerce.” But such possession is not, without more, a commercial act.

To be sure, *NFIB* does not explicitly repudiate the “substantial effects” test. Indeed, the Chief Justice’s opinion quotes *Darby*’s statement that “[t]he power of Congress over interstate commerce is not confined to the regulation of commerce among the states...” *Nat'l Fed'n of Indep. Bus.*, 567 U.S. at 549 (Roberts., C.J.

concurring); *see also id.* at 552-553 (Roberts., C.J. concurring)(distinguishing *Wickard v. Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111 (1942)). It is therefore perhaps possible to read *NFIB* narrowly: as an isolated prohibition on affirmatively compelling persons to engage in commerce. But it is difficult to understand how this reading of the case would be at all consistent with *NFIB*'s textual reasoning.

This is so because the text of the Commerce Clause does not distinguish between Congress's power to affect commerce by regulating non-commercial activity (like possessing a firearm), and its power to affect commerce by compelling people to join a commercial market (like health insurance). Rather it simply says that Congress may "regulate ... commerce between the several states." And that phrase either is or is not limited to laws that affect the legality of commercial activity. Five justices in *NFIB* took the text of the Clause seriously and permitted Congress to enact only those laws that were, themselves, regulations of commerce. *NFIB* thus allows Congress only the power "to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed." *Gibbons v. Ogden*, 22 U.S. 1, 196, 9 Wheat. 1 (1824).

And indeed, much of the Chief Justice's language in *NFIB* is consistent with this view. This opinion rejects the government's argument that the uninsured were "active in the market for health care" because they were "not currently engaged in any commercial activity involving health care..." *Id.* at 556 (Roberts., C.J. concurring) (emphasis added). The Chief Justice significantly observed that "[t]he individual mandate's regulation of the uninsured as a class is, in fact, particularly divorced from any link to existing commercial activity." *Id.* (Roberts., C.J. concurring)(emphasis

added). He reiterated that “[i]f the individual mandate is targeted at a class, it is a class whose commercial inactivity rather than activity is its defining feature.” *Id.* (Roberts., C.J. concurring)(emphasis added). He agreed that “Congress can anticipate the effects on commerce of an economic activity,” but did not say that it could anticipate a non-economic activity. *Id.* (Roberts., C.J. concurring)(emphasis added). And he finally said that Congress could not anticipate a future activity “in order to regulate individuals not currently engaged in commerce.” *Id.* (Roberts., C.J. concurring)(emphasis added). Accordingly, *NFIB* provides substantial support for the proposition that enactments under the Commerce Clause must regulate commercial or economic activity, not merely activity that affects commerce.

Here, the factual basis for the plea did not state that Petitioner’s possession of the gun was an economic activity. *See* Pet.App.C. Under the reasoning of *NFIB*, this should have been fatal to the conviction. As explained by *NFIB*, the Commerce Clause permits Congress to regulate only activities, i.e., the active participation in a market. But 18 U.S.C. §922(g)(1) criminalizes all possession, without reference to economic activity. Accordingly it sweeps too broadly.

Further, the factual basis did not show that Petitioner was engaged in the relevant market at the time of the regulated conduct. *See* Pet.App.C. The Chief Justice has noted that Congress cannot regulate a person’s activity under the Commerce Clause unless the person affected is “currently engaged” in the relevant market. *Id.* at 557. As an illustration, the Chief Justice provided the following example: “An individual who bought a car two years ago and may buy another in the

future is not ‘active in the car market’ in any pertinent sense.” *Id.* at 556 (emphasis added). As such, NFIB brought into serious question the long-standing notion that a firearm which has previously and remotely passed through interstate commerce should be considered to indefinitely affect commerce without “concern for when the [initial] nexus with commerce occurred.” *Scarborough*, 431 U.S. at 577.

Scarborough also stands in tension with *Bond v. United States*, 572 U.S. 844 (2014), which shows that §922(g) ought not be construed to reach the possession by felons of every firearm that has ever crossed state lines. Bond was convicted of violating 18 U.S.C. §229, a statute that criminalized the knowing possession or use of “any chemical weapon.” *Bond*, 572 U.S. at 853; 18 U.S.C. §229(a). She placed toxic chemicals – an arsenic compound and potassium dichromate – on the doorknob of a romantic rival. *See id.* The Court reversed her conviction, holding that any construction of the statute capable of reaching such conduct would compromise the chief role of states and localities in the suppression of crime. *See id.* at 865-866. It instead construed the statute to reach only the kinds of weapons and conduct associated with warfare. *See id.* at 859-862.

Notably, §229 defined the critical term “chemical weapon” broadly as “any chemical which through its chemical action on life processes can cause death, temporary incapacitation or permanent harm to humans or animals. The term includes all such chemicals, regardless of their origin or of their method of production, and regardless of whether they are produced in facilities, in munitions or elsewhere.” 18 U.S.C. §229F(8)(A). Further, it criminalized the use or possession of “any” such

weapon, not of a named subset. 18 U.S.C. §229(a). This Court nonetheless applied a more limited construction of the statute, reasoning that statutes should not be read in a way that sweeps in purely local activity:

The Government’s reading of section 229 would “alter sensitive federal-state relationships,” convert an astonishing amount of “traditionally local criminal conduct” into “a matter for federal enforcement,” and “involve a substantial extension of federal police resources.” [United States v.]Bass, 404 U.S. [336] 349-350, 92 S. Ct. 515, 30 L. Ed. 2d 488 [(1971)]. It would transform the statute from one whose core concerns are acts of war, assassination, and terrorism into a massive federal anti-poisoning regime that reaches the simplest of assaults. As the Government reads section 229, “hardly” a poisoning “in the land would fall outside the federal statute’s domain.” Jones [v. United States], 529 U.S. [848,] 857, 120 S. Ct. 1904, 146 L. Ed. 2d 902 [(2000)]. Of course Bond’s conduct is serious and unacceptable—and against the laws of Pennsylvania. But the background principle that Congress does not normally intrude upon the police power of the States is critically important. In light of that principle, we are reluctant to conclude that Congress meant to punish Bond’s crime with a federal prosecution for a chemical weapons attack.

Bond, 572 U.S. at 863

As in *Bond*, it is possible to read §922(g) to reach the conduct admitted here: possession of an object that once moved across state lines, without proof that the defendant’s conduct caused the object to move across state lines, nor even proof that it moved across state lines in the recent past. But to do so would intrude deeply on the traditional state responsibility for crime control. Such a reading would assert the federal government’s power to criminalize virtually any conduct anywhere in the country, with little or no relationship to commerce, nor to the interstate movement of commodities.

The better reading of the phrase “possess in or affecting commerce” – which appears in §922(g) – therefore requires a meaningful connection to interstate commerce. Such a reading would require either: 1) proof that the defendant’s offense caused the firearm to move in interstate commerce, or, at least, 2) proof that the firearm moved in interstate commerce at a time reasonably near the offense.

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 this 17th day of September, 2024.

JASON D. HAWKINS
Federal Public Defender
Northern District of Texas

/s/ Christy Martin
Christy Martin
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Federal Public Defender's Office
525 S. Griffin Street, Suite 629
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 767-2746
E-mail: christy_martin@fd.org

Attorney for Petitioner