

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

LADONTA A. TUCKER,

Applicant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

**Second Application for Extension of Time Within
Which to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to
the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit**

**APPLICATION TO THE HONORABLE JUSTICE
AMY CONEY BARRETT AS CIRCUIT JUSTICE**

ELLIOT J. LOUTHEN
ASSISTANT FEDERAL
PUBLIC DEFENDER
CENTRAL DISTRICT
OF ILLINOIS
300 W. Main Street
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217) 373-0666
elliott_louthen@fd.org

TOBIAS S. LOSS-EATON*
MATTHEW B. CAHILL
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 736-8291
tlosseaton@sidley.com

JEFFREY T. GREEN
DANIELLE HAMILTON
THE CARTER G. PHILLIPS/
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
SUPREME COURT CLINIC
NORTHWESTERN PRITZKER
SCHOOL OF LAW
375 East Chicago Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611

Counsel for Applicant

November 1, 2024

* Counsel of Record

SECOND APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Under this Court’s Rule 13.5, Applicant Ladonta Tucker respectfully requests a 28-day extension of time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari, to and including December 19, 2024.

JUDGMENT FOR WHICH REVIEW IS SOUGHT

The judgment for which review is sought is *United States v. Tucker*, 108 F.4th 973 (7th Cir. 2024) (attached as Exhibit 1).

JURISDICTION

This Court will have jurisdiction over any timely petition under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1). The Seventh Circuit issued its judgment on July 24, 2024. On October 15, 2024, Justice Barrett extended the deadline to file a petition through November 21, 2024. This application is being filed more than 10 days before that date.

REASONS JUSTIFYING AN EXTENSION OF TIME

1. Mr. Tucker was convicted of carjacking and carrying a firearm “during and in relation to” a crime of violence, *i.e.*, the carjacking, under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(1)(A)(i). He was sentenced to 160 months’ imprisonment. Mr. Tucker admitted he carried a firearm during the carjacking but argued on appeal that, because he never discharged, brandished, used, or even revealed the weapon, it did not facilitate—and therefore was not carried *in relation to*—the offense. The Seventh Circuit disagreed, reasoning that § 924(c)’s “in relation to” requirement is satisfied whenever a gun has “the potential to facilitate” an offense. Ex. 1 at 10.

The Seventh Circuit’s approach conflicts with decisions from other courts of appeals, which recognize that “in relation to” requires “a nexus between the carriage of the firearm and the underlying offense,” which exists only if a defendant “avails himself of the weapon,” the weapon “plays an integral role,” and the weapon “further[s] the purpose or effect of the crime.” *United States v. Shuler*, 181 F.3d 1188, 1190 (10th Cir. 1999) (cleaned up). In other circuits, the “[m]ere carrying” of a gun, or its coincidental “presence or involvement” at the scene, is “not sufficient to meet the ‘during and in relation to’ element.” *Id.* (cleaned up).

The decision below also conflicts with congressional intent and this Court’s guidance in *Smith v. United States*, 508 U.S. 223, 238 (1993); *Bailey v. United States*, 516 U.S. 137 (1995); and *Muscarello v. United States*, 524 U.S. 125 (1998). Indeed, just two terms ago, this Court held in *Dubin v. United States*, 143 S. Ct. 1557, 1565-66, 1572 (2023) that an identical “in relation to” limitation in the federal aggravated identity theft statute, 18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1), must be given a “limited” interpretation that requires the government to prove a violation “is at the crux of the underlying criminality, not an ancillary feature,” and that there must be “a relationship or nexus of some kind” between the crime and the prohibited conduct. Indeed, a “potential to facilitate” standard deprives “in relation to” of any independent meaning, effectively collapsing it with the statute’s “during” element.

2. An extension is warranted because Mr. Tucker has asked the Carter G. Phillips/Sidley Austin LLP Supreme Court Clinic at Northwestern Pritzker School of Law to help prepare his petition. An extension will allow the Clinic students to

research, draft, and revise a complete and cogent petition without conflicting with their academic schedules. In addition, the Clinic and undersigned counsel are responsible for forthcoming petitions in *Chisesi v. Hunady*, No. 24A311, *Kovac v. Wray*, No. 24A335, and *Brannan v. United States*, No. 23-40098 (5th Cir.), and a reply in support of the petition in *Aquart v. United States*, No. 24-5754. Undersigned counsel is also presenting oral argument in *Wisconsin Central Ltd. v. STB*, No. 24-1484 (7th Cir.), on November 15, and is responsible for pending district court litigation in *United States v. Norfolk Southern Corp.*, No. 1:24-cv-02226-ABJ (D.D.C.), and *Village of Minooka v. Wisc. Cent. Ltd.*, No. 1:24-cv-5200 (N.D. Ill.).

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests a 28-day extension of time within which to file a petition for a writ of certiorari, to and including December 19, 2024.

Respectfully submitted,

ELLIOT J. LOUTHEN
ASSISTANT FEDERAL
PUBLIC DEFENDER
CENTRAL DISTRICT
OF ILLINOIS
300 W. Main Street
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217) 373-0666
elliott_louthen@fd.org

TOBIAS S. LOSS-EATON*
MATTHEW B. CAHILL
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 736-8291
tlosseaton@sidley.com

JEFFREY T. GREEN
DANIELLE HAMILTON
THE CARTER G. PHILLIPS/
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
SUPREME COURT CLINIC
NORTHWESTERN PRITZKER
SCHOOL OF LAW
375 East Chicago Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611

Attorneys for Applicant

November 1, 2024

* Counsel of Record