

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	<b>CRIMINAL ACTION</b>
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>No. 10-20018-01-KHV</b>
	)	
<b>LAMONT T. DRAYTON,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	
_____	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

On March 22, 2011, the Court sentenced defendant to 240 months in prison based on a binding plea agreement under Rule 11(c)(1)(C), Fed. R. Crim. P. The United States Supreme Court recently held that a defendant who pleads guilty under Rule 11(c)(1)(C) may seek relief under Section 3582(c)(2) so long as the defendant’s guideline range was “part of the framework the district court relied on in imposing the sentence or accepting the agreement.” Hughes v. United States, 138 S. Ct. 1765, 1775 (June 4, 2018). On June 25, 2018, defendant filed a pro se Motion To Modify Or Reduce Sentence Pursuant To 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) (Doc. #135). For reasons stated below, the Court appoints counsel for defendant and directs the parties to file memoranda regarding defendant’s request for relief under Section 3582(c)(2).

**Analysis**

**I. Appointment Of Counsel**

In light of Hughes, defendant potentially is eligible for relief under Section 3582(c)(2). The Honorable J. Thomas Marten of the District of Kansas appointed the Office of the Federal Public Defender to represent any defendant previously determined to have been entitled to appointment of counsel or who is now indigent to determine whether that defendant may qualify for relief under

Amendment 782. Defendant previously qualified for appointment of counsel. Accordingly, the Court orders that if the Office of the Federal Public Defender can do so without violating relevant canons of ethics, it shall enter an appearance to represent defendant in this proceeding.

## **II. Additional Briefing On Defendant's Motion**

A federal district court may modify a defendant's sentence only where Congress has expressly authorized it to do so. See 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c); United States v. Blackwell, 81 F.3d 945, 947 (10th Cir. 1996). Defendant seeks relief under Section 3582(c)(2), which permits the Court to reduce a sentence if defendant has been sentenced to a term of imprisonment "based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(o)." 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c). To obtain relief under Section 3582(c)(2), defendant must overcome three distinct hurdles: (1) under the statute's "based on" clause, defendant must show he was sentenced based on a guideline range the Sentencing Commission lowered after his sentencing; (2) under the statute's "consistent with" clause, defendant must show that his request for a sentence reduction is consistent with the Commission's policy statements and (3) defendant must convince the district court that he is entitled to relief in light of the sentencing factors found in Section 3553(a). United States v. C.D., 848 F.3d 1286, 1289-90 (10th Cir. 2017). Under Tenth Circuit precedent, the first hurdle is jurisdictional. Id. at 1289.

So the Court can properly consider defendant's motion, the parties shall file memoranda which explain how defendant is eligible for relief under Section 3582(c)(2) and why relief is appropriate in light of the sentencing factors in Section 3553(a). In addition, the memoranda shall address (1) the factors that the Court relied on in accepting the recommended sentence in the Rule 11(c)(1)(C) agreement, (2) how defendant's guideline range impacted the Court's decision to

accept the Rule 11(c)(1)(C) agreement, (3) any public safety considerations and (4) defendant's post-sentencing conduct. See Hughes, 138 S. Ct. at 1778 (if district court would have imposed same sentence even if defendant had been subject to lower range, court has discretion to deny relief); United States v. Osborn, 679 F.3d 1193, 1195 (10th Cir. 2012) (in addition to Section 3553(a) factors, court may consider post-sentencing conduct); U.S.S.G. § 1B1.10 cmt. n.1(B)(ii) (public safety considerations); U.S.S.G. § 1B1.10 cmt. n.1(B)(iii) (post-sentencing conduct).

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that if the Office of the Federal Public Defender can do so without violating relevant canons of ethics, it shall enter an appearance to represent defendant in this proceeding by July 31, 2018.**

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that on or before August 10, 2018, defendant shall file through counsel a supplement to his motion. On or before August 24, 2018, the government may file a response.**

**The Clerk is directed to forward a copy of this order to the Office of the Federal Public Defender.**

Dated this 13th day of July, 2018 at Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ Kathryn H. Vratil  
KATHRYN H. VRATIL  
United States District Judge