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UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

## FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,
v.
SHAUN ROBERTS,
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 20-10411
D.C. No. 4:05-cr-00567-JSW-1

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of California Jeffrey S. White, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted November 17, 2021
San Francisco, California
Before: SCHROEDER, W. FLETCHER, and MILLER, Circuit Judges.
Shaun Roberts appeals the district court's denial of his motion under 18
U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) for reduction of sentence and compassionate release pursuant to the First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-391, 132 Stat. 5194. He is serving a 67-year sentence on multiple counts of armed robbery and use of a

[^0]firearm during a crime of violence. The district court denied his motion, holding that even if there were extraordinary and compelling reasons, the motion would have to be denied because Roberts is a danger to the community under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g).

The district court appears to have viewed the provision of the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual ("U.S.S.G.") § 1B1.13, which requires consideration of Section $3142(\mathrm{~g})$, to be a binding policy statement. The court therefore did not analyze the factors in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), although Section 3582(c)(1)(A) calls for such review. Nor did the court weigh Roberts's risk of severe illness from COVID-19 against the other Section 3553(a) factors.

Since the district court's decision, however, this court has held that U.S.S.G. $\S 1 \mathrm{~B} 1.13$ is not a binding policy statement for purposes of a Section 3582(c)(1)(A) motion. United States v. Aruda, 993 F.3d 797, 798 (9th Cir. 2021).

We therefore VACATE the district court's order and REMAND for consideration of Roberts' contentions and application of the appropriate factors.


[^0]:    This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

