

to the May 15, 2017 order would result in this Court presuming that he wished to proceed with his § 2255 motion as is. Mr. Elysee never responded to the May 15, 2017 order. Therefore, this Court will proceed to rule on his § 2255 motion as is.


Under Rule 4(b) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings, this Court must screen the § 2255 motion. “If it plainly appears from the petition and any attached exhibits that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court, the judge must dismiss the petition and direct the clerk to notify the petitioner.” *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2255 Rule 4(b). For the following reasons, the § 2255 motion will be summarily dismissed.

In *Johnson*, the United States Supreme Court held that the residual clause of the Armed Career Criminal Act (“ACCA”) was unconstitutionally void for vagueness. *See* 135 S. Ct. at 2556-57. In his § 2255 motion, Mr. Elysee asserts that his sentence should be corrected because it was improperly enhanced by a in the United States Sentencing Guidelines that is indistinguishable from the statutory provision found unconstitutional in *Johnson*. However, Mr. Elysee’s claim is foreclosed by the recent Supreme Court decision in *Beckles v. United States*, 137 S. Ct. 886 (2017). In *Beckles*, the Supreme Court held that “the advisory Sentencing Guidelines are not subject to a vagueness challenge under the Due Process Clause.” *See id.* at 895. Because Mr. Elysee’s challenge is to an enhancement under the Sentencing Guidelines, *Beckles* warrants summary dismissal of his § 2255 motion.

I will also deny a certificate of appealability. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an appeal may not be taken from a final order in a proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. A certificate of appealability may issue “only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). “A petitioner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that jurists of reason could

disagree with the district court's resolution of his constitutional claims or that jurists could conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003). Applying this standard, I find that a certificate of appealability shall not issue in this case. An appropriate order will be entered.

DATED: June 30, 2017



KEVIN MCNULTY
United States District Judge