

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

SIXTO SUERO-HERNANDEZ,  
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Respondent.

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

CIVIL NO. 10-1955 (JAG)  
Related No. 03-178 (JAG)

**OPINION & ORDER**

Before the Court is Petitioner Sixto Suero-Hernandez's (hereinafter "Petitioner" or "Suero-Hernandez") motion for habeas corpus relief filed under 28 U.S.C. Sec. 2255 (D.E. 2)<sup>1</sup>. Respondent United States of America timely filed its response (D.E. 8). For the reasons discussed below, the Petition shall be **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

**I. BACKGROUND**

On July 2, 2003, Petitioner, along with three other co-defendants, was indicted by a Federal Grand Jury (Crim. D.E. 18)<sup>2</sup>.

Count One (1) charged: On or about June 7, 2003, on the high seas and elsewhere on board a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, [1] Hugo Alexander Echevarría; [2] Pablo Vazquez; [3] Sixto Suero; [4] Pedro Silverio the defendants herein, aiding and abetting one

---

<sup>1</sup>D.E. is an abbreviation of docket entry.

<sup>2</sup>Crim. D.E. is an abbreviation of criminal docket entry number.

Civil No. 10-1955(JAG)

Page 2

another, did knowingly, intentionally, and unlawfully possess with intent to distribute more than five kilograms of cocaine, a Schedule II Controlled Substance, in violation of Title 46, United States Code Appendix, Section 1903(a), and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2. (Crim. D.E. 18).

Count Two (2) charged: On or about June 7, 2003, on the high seas and elsewhere within the jurisdiction of this Court, [1] Hugo Alexander Echevarría; [2] Pablo Vazquez; [3] Sixto Suero; [4] Pedro Silverio the defendants herein, did knowingly, unlawfully, and intentionally combine, conspire, and agree with each other and with other persons known and unknown to the Grand Jury, to commit an offense defined in Title 46, United States Code Appendix, Section 1903(a), that is, to possess with intent to distribute more than five (5) kilograms of cocaine, a Schedule II Controlled Substance, on board a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, all in violation of Title 46, United States Code Appendix, Section 1903(j). (Crim. D.E. 18).

On August 29, 2003, Petitioner, through his counsel, filed a Motion for Change of Plea (Crim. D.E. 39). On September 2, 2003, Petitioner's Plea Agreement with the Government was filed (Crim. D.E. 48). On September 2, 2003, Petitioner's Change of Plea Hearing was held

Civil No. 10-1955(JAG)

Page 3

(Crim.D.E. 54)<sup>3</sup>.

Pursuant to the terms and conditions of the Plea Agreement, Suero-Hernandez pled guilty to count two of the Indictment (Crim. D.E. 59). On October 10, 2003, Petitioner, through his counsel, filed a Sentencing Memorandum (Crim. D.E. 63). On December 4, 2003, Petitioner was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of one hundred and thirty five (135) months, a term of Supervised Release of five (5) years and a Special Monetary Assessment of one hundred (100) dollars (Crim. D.E. 83). On December 5, 2003, Petitioner's Judgment was entered (Crim. D.E. 83). On December 11, 2003, Petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal (Crim. D.E. 89).

On July 21, 2006, the First Circuit Court of Appeals issued its Judgment. The Appeals Court affirmed the sentence in part, and vacated the conditions of supervised release relating to drug testing and treatment (Appeal No. 04-1083, 1<sup>st</sup> Cir. July 21, 2006). On November 21, 2006, Petitioner's counsel filed a Sentencing Memorandum<sup>4</sup> (Crim.D.E. 170). On December 15, 2008, the Government filed its response in opposition to the previously filed sentencing memorandum (Crim.D.E. 175). On December 18, 2006, Suero-Hernandez's Re-Sentencing Hearing was held

---

<sup>3</sup>The Change of Plea Hearing was held before Magistrate Judge after Petitioner consented to proceed before a Magistrate Judge (Crim. D.E. 59).

<sup>4</sup>Petitioner's counsel for the re-sentencing phase was a new court-appointed attorney.

Civil No. 10-1955(JAG)

Page 4

(Crim. D.E. 176). Petitioner was re-sentenced to a term of imprisonment of one hundred and thirty five (135) months, a term of Supervised Release of five (5) years and a Special Monetary Assessment of one hundred (100) dollars<sup>5</sup> (Crim. D.E. 177). On December 19, 2006, the Amended Judgment was entered (Crim. D.E. 177). On December 28, 2006, Petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal (Crim.D.E. 178). Petitioner voluntarily dismissed this appeal pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 42(b) (Appeal No. 07-1200, 1<sup>st</sup> Cir. October 30, 2007).

Thereafter, in 2010, Petitioner filed a Motion before the First Circuit Court of Appeals requesting permission from the Court to file a successive petition under 28, United States Code, Section 2255, to challenge his 2003 guilty plea to charges of possession with intent to distribute cocaine (Crim. D.E. 237). On July 9, 2010, the First Circuit issued its Judgment stating that since Petitioner had not previously filed a petition for habeas corpus, he did not need the Appeals Court's permission to do so. The Appeals Court informed Suero-Hernandez that he could file his Petition directly in the district court (Appeal No. 10-1751, 1<sup>st</sup> Cir. July 9, 2010). On October 4, 2010, Petitioner's 2555 request for relief was filed (D.E. 2). As such this case is ready for disposition.

---

<sup>5</sup>As per the instructions of the First Circuit Court, the only variation in Petitioner's sentence was as to the number of drug tests to be performed in a year.

## II. DISCUSSION

Suero-Hernández raises only one claim of ineffective assistance of counsel: Petitioner alleges that his trial counsel never advised him the effect that his guilty plea would have on his immigration status, as required by the Supreme Court's decision of Padilla v. Kentucky, 130 S. Ct. 1473 (2010). Therefore, Petitioner contends his conviction should be vacated and he should have the opportunity to go to trial. The Court disagrees; in a nutshell, Petitioner's claim is time barred and must be dismissed.

Section 2255, as amended by the AEDPA<sup>6</sup> provides for a one year statute of limitations as follows:

(1) the date on which the judgment of conviction becomes final;

(2) the date on which the impediment to making a motion created by governmental action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the movant was prevented from making a motion by such governmental action;

(3) the date on which the right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if that right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or

(4) the date on which the facts supporting the claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise

---

<sup>6</sup>The AEDPA went into effect on April 24, 1996.

# 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.