

No. 24-6487

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

KAREEM REAVES, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES

SARAH M. HARRIS
Acting Solicitor General
Counsel of Record
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov
(202) 514-2217

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 24-6487

KAREEM REAVES, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

MEMORANDUM FOR THE UNITED STATES

Petitioner contends (Pet. 12-27) that 18 U.S.C. 922(g)(1), the federal statute that prohibits a person from possessing a firearm if he has been convicted of “a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year,” ibid., violates the Second Amendment. In United States v. Rahimi, 602 U.S. 680 (2024), this Court clarified the methodology for determining whether a firearms regulation complies with the Second Amendment. Since issuing that decision, the Court has granted certiorari in multiple cases presenting the question whether Section 922(g)(1) violates the Second Amendment, vacated the decisions below, and remanded for further consideration in light of Rahimi. See, e.g., Canada v. United

States, 145 S. Ct. 432 (2024) (No. 24-5391); Hoelt v. United States, 145 S. Ct. 431 (2024) (No. 24-5406); Talbot v. United States, 145 S. Ct. 430 (2024) (No. 24-5258).

The court of appeals issued its decision in this case after Rahimi. But the court explained that it was bound by its decision in United States v. Dubois, 94 F.4th 1284 (11th Cir. 2024), see Pet. App. A1, at 7, which this Court has vacated and remanded in light of Rahimi, see Dubois v. United States, No. 24-5744, 2025 WL 76413 (Jan. 13, 2025). Vacatur and remand would thus be warranted here if petitioner had properly preserved his Second Amendment claim below.

This Court has, however, consistently denied petitions for writs of certiorari raising Second Amendment challenges to Section 922(g)(1) when the petitioners have failed to preserve their claims in the lower courts. See, e.g., Trammell v. United States, No. 24-5723, 2024 WL 4743152 (Nov. 12, 2024); Chavez v. United States, 145 S. Ct. 459 (2024) (No. 24-5639); Dorsey v. United States, 145 S. Ct. 457 (2024) (No. 24-5623). Petitioner did not preserve his Second Amendment claim in the district court. See Gov't C.A. Mot. for Sum. Affirmance 2 (explaining that petitioner's claim was "unpreserved"); Pet. C.A. Resp. to Mot. for Sum. Affirmance 2 (conceding that petitioner's claim was "unpreserved," but arguing that plain-error review does not apply because "Second Amendment facial challenges" are purportedly "jurisdictional"). Accordingly,

consistent with this Court's practice in other cases, the Court should deny the petition for a writ of certiorari.*

Respectfully submitted.

SARAH M. HARRIS
Acting Solicitor General

MARCH 2025

* The government waives any further response to the petition for a writ of certiorari unless this Court requests otherwise.