USA v. Eugene Bernardini

Doc. 6012237570

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION

File Name: 14a0876n.06

No. 13-6180

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE	SIXTH CIRCUIT
	FILED
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Nov 21, 2014
or miles of miles,	DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk
Plaintiff-Appellee,	
) ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED
V.) STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
) THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
EUGENE BERNARDINI,) TENNESSEE
)
Defendant-Appellant.)

BEFORE: BATCHELDER and ROGERS, Circuit Judges; BECKWITH, District Judge.

PER CURIAM. Eugene Bernardini appeals his sentence.

Bernardini pleaded guilty to being a felon in possession of ammunition, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g). The district court determined that, because Bernardini had at least three previous convictions for a violent felony or serious drug offense that were committed on occasions different from one another, he was an armed career criminal under USSG § 4B1.4. Based on his total offense level of 31 and criminal history category of VI, Bernardini's guidelines range of imprisonment was 188 to 235 months. The district court sentenced him to 180 months in prison.

On appeal, Bernardini argues that the district court erred by concluding that his prior robbery conviction in Tennessee qualified as a violent felony under the Armed Career Criminal

^{*} The Honorable Sandra S. Beckwith, United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio, sitting by designation.

Case: 13-6180 Document: 21-1 Filed: 11/21/2014 Page: 2

No. 13-6180

United States v. Bernardini

Act (ACCA). We review de novo whether a defendant's prior conviction is a violent felony under the ACCA. United States v. Phillips, 752 F.3d 1047, 1049 (6th Cir. 2014), petition for cert. filed (Sept. 23, 2014) (No. 14-6442). As Bernardini concedes, we have previously held that a conviction for robbery in Tennessee under Tennessee Code Annotated § 39-13-401 qualifies as a violent felony under the ACCA, see United States v. Mitchell, 743 F.3d 1054, 1060, 1062 (6th Cir. 2014), petition for cert. filed (June 18, 2014) (No. 13-10682), and this panel is bound by that decision, see Sykes v. Anderson, 625 F.3d 294, 319 (6th Cir. 2010).

Accordingly, we affirm Bernardini's sentence.