

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JORGE LUIS OLIVERA,  
Defendant.

Case No. [5:11-cr-00355-EJD-22](#)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT’S  
AMENDED 28 U.S.C. § 2255 MOTION  
TO VACATE AND CORRECT  
CONVICTION AND SENTENCE**

Re: Dkt. No. 978

Before the Court is Defendant Jorge Luis Olivera’s Amended 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion to vacate and correct his conviction and sentence. 28 U.S.C. § 2255 Motion to Vacate (“Mot.”), Dkt. 978. On July 15, 2020, the Government filed its response to Defendant’s motion and requested that the Court resentence Defendant. Government’s Response to 2255 and Request for Plenary Re-Sentencing (“Response”), Dkt. 997. Thereafter, on July 30, 2020, Defendant filed his reply. Defendant’s Reply to Government’s Response to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 Motion to Vacate (“Reply”), Dkt. 1008. For the foregoing reasons, Defendant’s motion is **GRANTED**.

**I. BACKGROUND**

On March 10, 2017, Defendant entered into a plea agreement and pled guilty to two charges: racketeering conspiracy, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1962(d) (Count 1) and use of a firearm in relation to a crime of violence, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) (Count 4). *See* Mot. On June 26, 2017, the Court sentenced Defendant to 130 months in custody. *Id.* Pursuant to the sentencing order, Defendant received 70 months for Count 1 and a 60-month mandatory consecutive sentence for Count 4. Dkt. 766. Defendant is currently incarcerated at USP Terre

Case No.: [5:11-cr-00355-EJD-22](#)  
**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT’S AMENDED 28 U.S.C. § 2255 MOTION TO VACATE  
AND CORRECT CONVICTION AND SENTENCE**

1 Haute.

2 In June 2019, the United States Supreme Court held that 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)'s residual  
3 clause (which Defendant was charged and sentenced under) is unconstitutionally vague. *United*  
4 *States v. Davis*, 139 S. Ct. 2319, 2323–24 (2019). In light of *Davis*, Defendant moves under 28  
5 U.S.C. § 2255 for his conviction and sentence to be vacated, set aside, and corrected.

6 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

7 A federal sentencing court is authorized to grant relief if it concludes that “the sentence  
8 was imposed in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 2255(a).  
9 If the court finds that relief is warranted, it must vacate and set aside the judgment and then  
10 discharge the prisoner, resentence him, grant a new trial, or correct the sentence as may appear  
11 appropriate. *Id.* § 2255(b). A court may retroactively apply a constitutional rule of criminal  
12 procedure to a prisoner’s conviction and sentence if: (1) it places a class of conduct beyond the  
13 authority of the criminal law to proscribe or (2) it announces a watershed rule of criminal  
14 procedure. *See United States v. Brown*, 415 F. Supp. 3d 901, 904 (N.D. Cal. 2019).

15 **III. DISCUSSION**

16 On June 24, 2019, the United States Supreme Court held that the residual clause—the very  
17 statute Defendant was convicted under for Count Four—is unconstitutionally vague. *Davis*, 139  
18 S. Ct. at 2323–24. The Government does not dispute that *Davis* applies retroactively or that it  
19 requires the Court to vacate Defendant’s § 924(c) conviction, *i.e.*, Count Four. *See* Response at 5.  
20 Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendant’s § 2255 motion and vacates Defendant’s § 924(c)  
21 conviction and sentence.

22 The Government instead argues that this Court should resentence Defendant on the  
23 remaining count of conviction, *i.e.* Count One. *See id.* But, “the usual remedy is to set aside the  
24 counts on which illegal convictions were obtained and to leave untouched the valid convictions.”  
25 *United States v. Barron*, 172 F.3d 1153, 1160 (9th Cir. 1999). The court has “wide discretion” to  
26 issue whatever remedy it deems “appropriate.” *Troiano v. United States*, 918 F.3d 1082, 1086

1 (9th Cir. 2019) (holding that the standard of review for a district court’s determination of the  
 2 appropriate remedy in a § 2255 is abuse of discretion); *United States v. Handa*, 122 F.3d 690, 691  
 3 (9th Cir. 1997) (Section 2255 confers on district courts “broad and flexible power” to craft an  
 4 appropriate remedy). Indeed, just recently, this Court declined to hold a resentencing hearing in  
 5 two comparable cases. *See United States v. Cardenas*, 2019 WL 7020193 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 20,  
 6 2019); *see also United States v. Cisneros*, 2020 WL 4349825 (N.D. Cal. July 29, 2020). As in  
 7 *Cardenas* and *Cisneros*, there is no need to hold a resentencing hearing because the Court can  
 8 easily excise the 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) conviction and sentence, while leaving the 18 U.S.C.  
 9 § 1962(d) count intact. *See id.* at \*2; *see also Brown*, 415 F. Supp. 3d at 907 (declining to hold a  
 10 resentencing hearing due to the “straightforward nature of correcting [the defendant’s] conviction  
 11 and sentence”).

12 The Government uses *Troiano* to argue that when a count is vacated such that it impacts  
 13 the relevant Guideline range, the district court must engage in resentencing. Response at 5–7. In  
 14 fact, in *Troiano*, the Ninth Circuit specifically noted that “the decision to unbundle a sentencing  
 15 package—that is, to conduct a full resentencing on all remaining counts of conviction when one or  
 16 more counts of a multi-count conviction are undone—rests *within the sound discretion of the*  
 17 *district court.*” 918 F.3d at 1087 (emphasis added); *see also id.* at 1086–87 (“[T]he decision to  
 18 restructure a defendant’s entire sentence when only one of the counts of conviction is found to be  
 19 invalid is discretionary and not . . . mandatory.”). Indeed, in *Troiano*, “it [was] evident from the  
 20 record . . . that *Troiano*’s counts of conviction were not actually grouped for sentencing in any  
 21 material way that might have led the district court, in its discretion, to unbundle them for  
 22 resentencing.” *Id.* at 1087. Hence, nothing in *Troiano* forbids a court (in its discretion) to decline  
 23 to resentence, so long as the counts of conviction are grouped in such a way that they can be  
 24 unbundled. *Id.*; *see also id.* at 1088 (noting that removing the sentencing enhancement for the  
 25 vacated count would not have “any impact on the sentences for the unaffected counts”).

1 Here, it is simple to excise the sentence for Count 4. Defendant received 70 months for  
2 Count 1 and a 60-month mandatory consecutive sentence for Count 4. Hence, the Court can  
3 simply excise the 60-month mandatory sentence for Count 4 and correct Defendant's conviction  
4 and sentence without having a resentencing hearing. *See Brown*, 415 F Supp. 3d at 907.

5 Moreover, there are good reasons not to resentence Defendant. USP Terre Haute, where  
6 Defendant is incarcerated, has reported COVID-19 cases. Additional time could subject  
7 Defendant to the unnecessary risk of acquiring COVID-19. Moreover, Defendant has engaged in  
8 post-sentence rehabilitation and has disavowed gang membership and thus cannot associate with  
9 gang members. For these reasons, the Court declines to have a resentencing hearing. As  
10 Defendant has already served the 70-month custodial sentence on Count 1, see Dkt. 737 (in  
11 custody since January 30, 2014), he must be released forthwith from the custody of the Bureau of  
12 Prisons.

13 **IV. CONCLUSION**

14 For the foregoing reasons, Defendant's 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) conviction and sentence are  
15 vacated. As he has already completed his sentence for Count One, he must be released forthwith  
16 from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons. Nothing in this Order shall affect the five-year  
17 supervised release ordered for Count One. *See Judgment*, Dkt. 766. Finally, in light of the  
18 ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, Defendant must quarantine himself for 14-days upon release.

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20 Dated: August 3, 2020

21   
22 EDWARD J. DAVILA  
23 United States District Judge  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Case No.: [5:11-cr-00355-EJD-22](#)

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S AMENDED 28 U.S.C. § 2255 MOTION TO VACATE  
AND CORRECT CONVICTION AND SENTENCE