### In The

## Supreme Court of the United States

STEPHEN DOMINICK MCFADDEN,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Fourth Circuit

### BRIEF FOR AMICUS CURIAE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CRIMINAL DEFENSE LAWYERS IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER

TERRANCE G. REED LANKFORD & REED, PLLC

Barbara E. Bergman Co-Chair, NACDL Amicus Committee JAMES E. ROGERS COLLEGE OF LAW UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA 1201 E. Speedway Blvd. Tucson, AZ 85721 (520) 621-3984 bbergman@email.arizona.edu

HOWARD SREBNICK

Counsel of Record

JOSHUA SHORE

BLACK, SREBNICK, KORNSPAN

& STUMPF, P.A.

201 S. Biscayne Blvd.

Miami, FL 33131

(305) 371-6421

HSrebnick@RoyBlack.com

COCKLE LEGAL BRIEFS (800) 225-6964 WWW.COCKLELEGALBRIEFS.COM

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE	1
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	2
ARGUMENT	4
The Court Should Grant Certiorari to Confirm that Instructional Error as to a <i>Contested</i> Element is Never Harmless	4
A. The Constitution Prohibits Judges from Directing a Verdict on a <i>Contested</i> Element of a Criminal Offense	4
B. The Circuits are Split Over Whether Overwhelming Evidence Can Render Harmless the Omission of a <i>Contested</i> Element, and the Issue is a Recurring One	13
C. This Case Presents an Ideal Vehicle to Resolve the Lower Court Confusion Over the Harmless Error Test Applicable to Instructional Errors	17
CONCLUSION	24



### TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page
Cases:
Bollenbach v. United States, 326 U.S. 607 (1946) 7
Brecht v. Abrahamson, 507 U.S. 619 (1993)8
Burks v. United States, 437 U.S. 1 (1978)12
Carpenters v. United States, 330 U.S. 395 (1947)5
Chapman v. California, 386 U.S. 18 (1967)8, 10, 15
Coleman v. Johnson, 132 S. Ct. 2060 (2012)21
Duncan v. Louisiana, 391 U.S. 145 (1968)5, 8
Elonis v. United States, 135 S. Ct. 2001 (2015)19
Ex Parte Milligan, 71 U.S. 1 (1866)7
Glebe v. Frost, 135 S. Ct. 429 (2014)22
Herring v. New York, 422 U.S. 853 (1975)22, 23
Kotteakos v. United States, 328 U.S. 750 (1946)8
Lighting Fixture & Elec. Supply Co. v. Cont'l Ins. Co., 420 F.2d 1211 (5th Cir. 1969)20
Luce v. United States, 469 U.S. 38 (1984)22
McFadden v. United States, 135 S. Ct. 2298           (2015)18
Monsanto v. United States, 348 F.3d 345 (2d Cir. 2003)2, 16
Neder v. United States, 527 U.S. 1 (1999)passim
Owens v. United States, 483 F.3d 48 (1st Cir. 2007)22
Rose v. Clark, 478 U.S. 570 (1986)



### TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
Sullivan v. Louisiana, 508 U.S. 275 (1993)	8
Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Inc., 551 U.S. 308 (2007)	18
United Bhd. of Carpenters & Joiners of Am. v. United States, 330 U.S. 395 (1947)	7
United States v. Alexander, 817 F.3d 1205 (10th Cir. 2016)	17
United States v. Alvarado, 816 F.3d 242 (4th Cir. 2016)	17
United States v. Bailey, 270 F.3d 83 (1st Cir. 2001)	13
United States v. Brown, 202 F.3d 691 (4th Cir. 2000)2,	16, 21
United States v. Choudhry, 649 F. App'x 60, 2016 WL 2942532 (2d Cir. 2016)	16
United States v. DiLeo, 625 F. App'x 464, 2015 WL 5099473 (11th Cir. 2015)	2
United States v. Elonis, 841 F.3d 589 (3d Cir. 2016)	16
United States v. Ford, 821 F.3d 63 (1st Cir. 2016)	16
United States v. Gaudin, 515 U.S. 506 (1995)	7
United States v. Haire, 371 F.3d 833 (D.C. Cir. 2004)	2
United States v. Houston, 792 F.3d 663 (6th Cir. 2015)	17



### TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
United States v. Janis, 810 F.3d 595 (8th Cir. 2016)	17
United States v. Martin Linen Supply Co., 430 U.S. 564 (1977)	5, 8
United States v. Maslenjak, 821 F.3d 675 (6th Cir. 2016)	
United States v. Miguel, 338 F.3d 995 (9th Cir. 2003)	22
United States v. Nosal, F.3d, 2016 WL 7190670 (9th Cir. Dec. 8, 2016)	16
United States v. Perez, 280 F.3d 318 (3d Cir. 2002)	2
United States v. Pizarro, 772 F.3d 284 (1st Cir. 2014)2,	
United States v. Prigmore, 243 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2001)	13
United States v. Reza-Ramos, 816 F.3d 1110 (9th Cir. 2016)	17
United States v. Stanford, 823 F.3d 814 (5th Cir. 2016), cert. denied on other grounds, No. 16-454, 2016 WL 5851763 (U.S. Nov. 7, 2016)	16, 21
United States v. Takhalov, 827 F.3d 1307 (11th Cir. 2016)	16
United States v. United States Gypsum Co., 438 U.S. 422 (1978)	19
United States v. White, 810 F.3d 212 (4th Cir. 2016)	17



# DOCKET

# 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.

