

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  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
HUNG VAN HUYNH (1),  
Defendant.

Case No.: 09cr1442-MMA-1  
*Related Case No.: 16cv1769-MMA*

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S  
MOTION TO VACATE UNDER 28  
U.S.C. § 2255**

[Doc. No. 82]

On December 1, 2011, pursuant to a written plea agreement, Defendant Hung Van Hyunh pleaded guilty to count four of a Superseding Indictment for distributing 220.8 grams of cocaine, a Schedule II controlled substance, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, section 841(a)(1), and Title 18, section 2. *See* Doc. No. 53. The Court sentenced Defendant on June 4, 2012 to a term of 180 months imprisonment. *See* Doc. No. 64. Defendant filed a successive motion<sup>1</sup> pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255, challenging his classification as a career offender under the United States Sentencing Guidelines in

---

<sup>1</sup> The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit granted Defendant’s application for authorization to file a successive 2255 motion. *See* Doc. No. 86-1.

1 light of *Johnson v. United States*, 576 U.S. ---, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (2015). See Doc. No. 82.  
2 The government filed a response in opposition to Defendant’s motion. See Doc. No. 87.

3 In *Johnson*, the Supreme Court held the residual clause in the definition of a  
4 “violent felony” in the Armed Career Criminal Act of 1984, 18 U.S.C. § 924(e)(2)(B)  
5 (“ACCA”), to be unconstitutionally vague and a violation of the Due Process Clause.  
6 135 S. Ct. at 2557. Defendant was not sentenced under the ACCA’s residual clause; he  
7 was sentenced based on the career offender enhancement provision of the Sentencing  
8 Guidelines. Nonetheless, Defendant argues that *Johnson*’s holding is applicable, because  
9 the ACCA’s residual clause is identical in language to Section 4B1.2’s residual clause.  
10 However, on March 6, 2017, the Supreme Court ruled that *Johnson*’s holding does not  
11 extend to the Sentencing Guidelines, in so far as “the advisory Guidelines are not subject  
12 to vagueness challenges under the Due Process Clause.”<sup>2</sup> *Beckles v. United States*, 137 S.  
13 Ct. 886, 197 L. Ed. 2d 145 (2017). Under *Beckles*, “it plainly appears from the face of  
14 the motion” that Defendant “is not entitled to relief.” See Rule 4(b) of the Rules  
15 Governing Section 2255 Proceedings for the United States District Courts. As such,  
16 Defendant’s 2255 motion must be denied.

17 **CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

18 Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings for the United States  
19 District Courts provides that “[t]he district court must issue or deny a certificate of  
20 appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant.” A defendant must  
21 obtain a certificate of appealability before pursuing any appeal from a final order in a  
22 Section 2255 proceeding. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). When the denial of a Section  
23 2255 motion is based on the merits of the claims in the motion, a district court should  
24 issue a certificate of appealability only when the appeal presents a “substantial showing  
25

---

26  
27 <sup>2</sup> Subsequent to the issuance of *Beckles*, Defendant requested thirty (30) days in which to review the  
28 Supreme Court’s decision and submit a reply brief. See Doc. No. 88. Defendant also asked the Court to  
defer ruling on his 2255 motion in the interim. *Id.* More than thirty days has passed, and to date,  
Defendant has not filed any additional briefing.

1 of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The defendant must  
2 show that reasonable jurists could debate whether the issues should have been resolved  
3 differently or are “adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *Slack v.*  
4 *McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483 (2000), quoting *Barefoot v. Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 n.4  
5 (1983), superseded on other grounds by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *see also Mendez v.*  
6 *Knowles*, 556 F.3d 757, 771 (9th Cir. 2009). Because Defendant has not made a  
7 substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, and because the Court finds  
8 that reasonable jurists would not debate the denial of Defendant’s motion, the Court  
9 declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 Based on the foregoing, the Court **DENIES** Defendant’s 2255 motion. The Court  
12 **DECLINES** to issue a certificate of appealability. The Clerk of Court is instructed to  
13 enter judgment in accordance herewith and close the related civil case.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 DATE: April 17, 2017

16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 HON. MICHAEL M. ANELLO  
19 United States District Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28