

APPENDIX A

Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second
Circuit, *In re United States*, No. 18-3430 (Dec. 18, 2019)

18-3430

In re: United States of America

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Second Circuit**

AUGUST TERM 2018

Docket No. 18-3430

IN RE: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Petitioner,

v.

YEHUDI MANZANO,

Respondent.

ARGUED: FEBRUARY 13, 2019

DECIDED: DECEMBER 18, 2019

Before: PARKER, CHIN, AND SULLIVAN, *Circuit Judges.*

On the eve of trial, the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (Underhill, *Chief Judge*) ruled that Respondent – who is charged with,

inter alia, production of child pornography, an offense punishable by a mandatory minimum term of fifteen years' imprisonment – could argue jury nullification at trial. The district court also reserved decision on whether evidence of sentencing consequences would be admissible. The government now petitions for a writ of mandamus directing the district court to preclude defense counsel from arguing nullification and to exclude any evidence of sentencing consequences. We hold that the conditions for mandamus relief are satisfied with respect to the district court's nullification ruling, but not with respect to the admissibility of evidence of sentencing consequences. Thus, we grant in part and deny in part the petition.

Judge Parker concurs in part and dissents in part in a separate opinion.

SANDRA S. GLOVER, Assistant United States Attorney (Sarah P. Karwan, Neeraj Patel, Assistant United States Attorneys, *on the brief*), for John H. Durham, United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut, New Haven, CT, *for Petitioner*.

NORMAN A. PATTIS, Pattis & Smith, LLC, New Haven, CT, *for Respondent*.

JOHN GLEESON (Pooja A. Boisture, Nathan S. Richards, *on the brief*), Debevoise & Plimpton LLP, New York, NY, *for Amicus Curiae* The Honorable Stefan R. Underhill.

Clark M. Neily III, Jay R. Schweikert, Cato Institute, Washington, D.C., *counsel of record*, Mary Price, FAMM Foundation, Washington, D.C., Peter Goldberger, Ardmore, PA, Joel B. Rudin, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, New York, NY, *for Amici Curiae* Cato Institute, FAMM Foundation, and National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers.

Timothy Lynch, The Fully Informed Jury Association, Helena, MT, *for Amicus Curiae*
The Fully Informed Jury Association.

RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, *Circuit Judge*:

Respondent Yehudi Manzano stands charged with production of child pornography, an offense punishable by a mandatory minimum term of fifteen years' imprisonment, and transportation of child pornography, which is punishable by a mandatory minimum term of five years' imprisonment. Shortly before trial, he filed motions requesting permission to argue for jury nullification – in essence, that the jury should render a verdict not in accordance with the law – and to present evidence regarding the sentencing consequences of a conviction in this case. On the eve of trial, the district court (Underhill, *Chief Judge*) granted Manzano's request to argue jury nullification, but reserved decision on the admissibility of evidence regarding the sentencing consequences of a conviction.

The government now seeks a writ of mandamus directing the district court to (1) preclude defense counsel from arguing jury nullification, and (2) exclude any evidence of sentencing consequences at trial. Applying settled law in this circuit, we hold that the government has a clear and indisputable right to a writ directing the district court to deny defense counsel's motion for leave to argue jury

nullification, and that the other conditions for mandamus relief are satisfied. We further hold that, at this time, the government does not possess a clear and indisputable right to a writ directing the district court to exclude any evidence of sentencing consequences.

Accordingly, we grant in part and deny in part the government's petition.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Facts¹

In October 2016, law enforcement officers in Connecticut received information that a 15-year-old girl, M.M., had been in a sexual relationship with Yehudi Manzano, the 31-one-year-old landlord of the building where she lived. During the ensuing state investigation, officers searched Manzano's cell phone pursuant to a warrant and discovered a video of M.M. and Manzano engaged in sexually explicit conduct.

M.M. knew that Manzano was recording the video at the time, and Manzano did not threaten her or force her to engage in the sexual conduct. Nonetheless, M.M. was 15 years old when the video was recorded and therefore was incapable

¹ The following facts have not yet been admitted into evidence in the district court, but the parties do not dispute them for the limited purpose of our review of the government's petition.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.