

**NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION**

**File Name: 13a0244n.06**

**No. 02-2391**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

**FILED**  
**Mar 08, 2013**  
DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

|                           |   |                                  |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, | ) |                                  |
|                           | ) |                                  |
| Plaintiff-Appellee,       | ) |                                  |
|                           | ) |                                  |
| v.                        | ) | On Appeal from the United States |
|                           | ) | District Court for the Eastern   |
| JACK LEWIS THOMAS,        | ) | District of Michigan             |
|                           | ) |                                  |
| Defendant-Appellant.      | ) |                                  |

Before:       BOGGS and DAUGHTREY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM. Defendant-appellant Jack Thomas was convicted of two counts of bank robbery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2113(a), and one count of possessing a firearm in furtherance of a crime of violence (the second bank robbery), in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c). The district court sentenced Thomas to concurrent terms of 135 months’ imprisonment for each count of bank robbery, followed by a mandatory consecutive term of 84 months’ imprisonment for the § 924(c) count. Thomas appealed, and we affirmed. *United States v. Thomas*, 105 F. App’x 773, 775 (6th Cir. 2004). Thomas has moved for rehearing, asking that we vacate his sentence and remand to the district court for re-sentencing.

We agree, and the government concedes, that Thomas is entitled to a remand and re-sentencing under *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005). *Booker* applies to all cases on direct review, *id.* at 268, including cases such as Thomas’s for which a petition for rehearing or rehearing

No. 02-2391

United States v. Thomas

en banc is pending. At Thomas's original sentencing hearing, the district court treated the Sentencing Guidelines as mandatory, which, after *Booker*, constitutes plain error. See *United States v. Barnett*, 398 F.3d 516, 525–26, 529–30 (6th Cir. 2005). Because there is no clear and specific evidence that the district court would have imposed the same sentence post-*Booker*, Thomas's case must be remanded for the district court to re-sentence him under the procedures set out in *Booker*. See also *United States v. McFalls*, 675 F.3d 599, 604–05 (6th Cir. 2012).