

FILED

United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

May 17, 2016

Elisabeth A. Shumaker
Clerk of Court

IN RE: RAYMOND EDWARD
ANDERSON,

Movant.

No. 16-7038
(D.C. No. 6:95-CR-00053-FHS-1)
(E.D. Okla.)

ORDER

Before **KELLY, HARTZ, and MATHESON**, Circuit Judges.

Movant Raymond Edward Anderson, a federal prisoner proceeding through counsel, seeks an order authorizing him to file a second or successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion in the district court so he may assert a claim for relief based on *Johnson v. United States*, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (2015).¹ See 28 U.S.C. §§ 2255(h), 2244(b)(3). Because Movant has made a prima facie showing that he satisfies the relevant conditions for authorization under § 2255(h)(2), we grant authorization.

Movant received a sentence enhanced under the guideline for career offenders, which is triggered by the defendant having “two prior qualifying felony convictions of either a crime of violence or a controlled substance offense,” U.S.S.G. § 4B1.1(a). He alleges that at least one of his prior convictions qualified for this purpose by virtue of the residual clause in the guideline’s definition of a crime of violence, which encompasses crimes that “involve[] conduct that presents a serious potential risk of physical injury to

¹ The Federal Public Defender for the Eastern District of Oklahoma is appointed to represent Raymond Edward Anderson pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B).

another,” *id.* § 4B1.2(a)(2). An identical clause in the Armed Career Criminal Act was invalidated in *Johnson* on the ground that it was unconstitutionally vague.

To obtain authorization, Movant must make a prima facie showing that his claim meets the gatekeeping requirements of § 2255(h). 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(C); *see Case v. Hatch*, 731 F.3d 1015, 1028–29 (10th Cir. 2013). A claim may be authorized under § 2255(h)(2) if it relies on “a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable.” *Johnson* announced a new rule of constitutional law that was made retroactive to cases on collateral review in *Welch v. United States*, 136 S. Ct. 1257, 1265 (2016). We held in *In re Encinias*, No. 16–8038, 2016 WL 1719323, at *2 (10th Cir. Apr. 29, 2016) (*per curiam*), that second or successive § 2255 motions that rely on *Johnson* to challenge the career offender guideline qualify for authorization under § 2255(h)(2).

Accordingly, we grant Raymond Edward Anderson authorization to file a second or successive § 2255 motion in district court to raise a claim based on *Johnson v. United States*.

Entered for the Court



ELISABETH A. SHUMAKER, Clerk