

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION **GUIDELINES MANUAL** **2024**

Supplement to Appendix C



CARLTON W. REEVES
Chair

LAURA E. MATE
Vice Chair

CLAIRE MURRAY
Vice Chair

LUIS FELIPE RESTREPO
Vice Chair

CLARIA HORN BOOM
Commissioner

JOHN GLEESON
Commissioner

CANDICE C. WONG
Commissioner

SCOTT A.C. MEISLER
Commissioner, *Ex-officio*

PATRICIA K. CUSHWA
Commissioner, *Ex-officio*

This document contains amendments to the Guidelines Manual effective November 1, 2012, November 1, 2013, November 1, 2014, November 1, 2015, August 1, 2016, November 1, 2016, November 1, 2018, November 1, 2023, and November 1, 2024.

Amendment 821

In promulgating this amendment, the Commission recognizes that these circuit conflicts involve guideline and commentary provisions that Congress directly amended, and that Congress also directed the Commission not to “alter or repeal” the congressional amendments. *See* Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003, Pub. L. 108–21, § 401(g), (j)(4), 117 Stat. 650. In recognition of this limitation, the amendment defines a term that the congressional amendments did not define—“preparing for trial”—without altering or repealing the amendments that Congress made.

Effective Date: The effective date of this amendment is November 1, 2023.

AMENDMENT 821

AMENDMENT:

Part A (Status Points under §4A1.1)

The Commentary to §2P1.1 captioned “Application Notes” is amended in Note 5 by striking “§4A1.1(d)” and inserting “§4A1.1(e)”.

Section 4A1.1 is amended—

by striking subsection (d) as follows:

- “(d) Add 2 points if the defendant committed the instant offense while under any criminal justice sentence, including probation, parole, supervised release, imprisonment, work release, or escape status.”;

by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d);

and by inserting at the end the following new subsection (e):

- “(e) Add 1 point if the defendant (1) receives 7 or more points under subsections (a) through (d), and (2) committed the instant offense while under any criminal justice sentence, including probation, parole, supervised release, imprisonment, work release, or escape status.”.

The Commentary to §4A1.1 captioned “Application Notes” is amended—

by striking Note 4 as follows:

- “4. §4A1.1(d). Two points are added if the defendant committed any part of the instant offense (*i.e.*, any relevant conduct) while under any criminal justice sentence, including probation, parole, supervised release, imprisonment, work release, or escape status. Failure to report for service of a sentence of imprisonment is to be treated as an escape from such sentence. *See* §4A1.2(n). For the purposes of this subsection, a ‘criminal justice sentence’ means a sentence countable under §4A1.2 (Definitions and Instructions for Computing Criminal History) having a custodial or supervisory component, although active supervision is not required for this subsection to apply. For example, a term of unsupervised probation would be included; but a sentence to pay a fine, by itself, would not be included. A defendant who commits the instant offense while a violation warrant from a prior sentence is outstanding (*e.g.*, a probation, parole, or supervised release violation warrant) shall be deemed to be under a criminal justice

sentence for the purposes of this provision if that sentence is otherwise countable, even if that sentence would have expired absent such warrant. *See* §4A1.2(m).”;

by redesignating Note 5 as Note 4;

in Note 4 (as so redesignated) by striking “§4A1.1(e)” each place such term appears and inserting “§4A1.1(d)”;

and by inserting at the end the following new note 5:

- “5. §4A1.1(e). One point is added if the defendant (1) receives 7 or more points under §4A1.1(a) through (d), and (2) committed any part of the instant offense (*i.e.*, any relevant conduct) while under any criminal justice sentence, including probation, parole, supervised release, imprisonment, work release, or escape status. Failure to report for service of a sentence of imprisonment is to be treated as an escape from such sentence. *See* §4A1.2(n). For the purposes of this subsection, a ‘criminal justice sentence’ means a sentence countable under §4A1.2 (Definitions and Instructions for Computing Criminal History) having a custodial or supervisory component, although active supervision is not required for this subsection to apply. For example, a term of unsupervised probation would be included; but a sentence to pay a fine, by itself, would not be included. A defendant who commits the instant offense while a violation warrant from a prior sentence is outstanding (*e.g.*, a probation, parole, or supervised release violation warrant) shall be deemed to be under a criminal justice sentence for the purposes of this provision if that sentence is otherwise countable, even if that sentence would have expired absent such warrant. *See* §4A1.2(m).”.

The Commentary to §4A1.1 captioned “Background” is amended in the last paragraph by striking “Section 4A1.1(d) adds two points if the defendant was under a criminal justice sentence during any part of the instant offense” and inserting “Section 4A1.1(e) adds one point if the defendant receives 7 or more points under §4A1.1(a) through (d) and was under a criminal justice sentence during any part of the instant offense”.

Section 4A1.2 is amended—

in subsection (a)(2) by striking “§4A1.1(e)” and inserting “§4A1.1(d)”;

in subsection (m) by striking “§4A1.1(d)” and inserting “§4A1.1(e)”;

in subsection (n) by striking “§4A1.1(d)” and inserting “§4A1.1(e)”;

and in subsection (p) by striking “§4A1.1(e)” and inserting “§4A1.1(d)”.

Part B (Zero-Point Offenders)

Subpart 1 (Adjustment for Certain Zero-Point Offenders)

Chapter Four is amended by inserting at the end the following new Part C:

“ PART C — ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN ZERO-POINT OFFENDERS

§4C1.1. *Adjustment for Certain Zero-Point Offenders*

(a) *Adjustment.*—If the defendant meets all of the following criteria:

Amendment 821

- (1) the defendant did not receive any criminal history points from Chapter Four, Part A;
- (2) the defendant did not receive an adjustment under §3A1.4 (Terrorism);
- (3) the defendant did not use violence or credible threats of violence in connection with the offense;
- (4) the offense did not result in death or serious bodily injury;
- (5) the instant offense of conviction is not a sex offense;
- (6) the defendant did not personally cause substantial financial hardship;
- (7) the defendant did not possess, receive, purchase, transport, transfer, sell, or otherwise dispose of a firearm or other dangerous weapon (or induce another participant to do so) in connection with the offense;
- (8) the instant offense of conviction is not covered by §2H1.1 (Offenses Involving Individual Rights);
- (9) the defendant did not receive an adjustment under §3A1.1 (Hate Crime Motivation or Vulnerable Victim) or §3A1.5 (Serious Human Rights Offense); and
- (10) the defendant did not receive an adjustment under §3B1.1 (Aggravating Role) and was not engaged in a continuing criminal enterprise, as defined in 21 U.S.C. § 848;

decrease the offense level determined under Chapters Two and Three by 2 levels.

(b) *Definitions and Additional Considerations.—*

- (1) ‘Dangerous weapon,’ ‘firearm,’ ‘offense,’ and ‘serious bodily injury’ have the meaning given those terms in the Commentary to §1B1.1 (Application Instructions).
- (2) ‘Sex offense’ means (A) an offense, perpetrated against a minor, under (i) chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code; (ii) chapter 110 of title 18, not including a recordkeeping offense; (iii) chapter 117 of title 18, not including transmitting information about a minor or filing a factual statement about an alien individual; or (iv) 18 U.S.C. § 1591; or (B) an attempt or a conspiracy to commit any offense described in subparagraphs (A)(i) through (iv) of this definition.
- (3) In determining whether the defendant’s acts or omissions resulted in ‘substantial financial hardship’ to a victim, the court shall consider, among other things, the non-exhaustive list of factors provided in Application Note 4(F) of the Commentary to §2B1.1 (Theft, Property Destruction, and Fraud).

Commentary

Application Notes:

1. *Application of Subsection (a)(6).*—The application of subsection (a)(6) is to be determined independently of the application of subsection (b)(2) of §2B1.1 (Theft, Property Destruction, and Fraud).
2. *Upward Departure.*—An upward departure may be warranted if an adjustment under this guideline substantially underrepresents the seriousness of the defendant’s criminal history. For example, an upward departure may be warranted if the defendant has a prior conviction or other comparable judicial disposition for an offense that involved violence or credible threats of violence.”.

Subpart 2 (Implementation of 28 U.S.C. § 994(j))

The Commentary to §5C1.1 captioned “Application Notes” is amended—

by inserting at the beginning of Note 1 the following new heading: “*Application of Subsection (a).*—”;

by inserting at the beginning of Note 2 the following new heading: “*Application of Subsection (b).*—”;

by inserting at the beginning of Note 3 the following new heading: “*Application of Subsection (c).*—”;

by striking Note 4 as follows:

“If the defendant is a nonviolent first offender and the applicable guideline range is in Zone A or B of the Sentencing Table, the court should consider imposing a sentence other than a sentence of imprisonment, in accordance with subsection (b) or (c)(3). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 994(j). For purposes of this application note, a ‘nonviolent first offender’ is a defendant who has no prior convictions or other comparable judicial dispositions of any kind and who did not use violence or credible threats of violence or possess a firearm or other dangerous weapon in connection with the offense of conviction. The phrase ‘comparable judicial dispositions of any kind’ includes diversionary or deferred dispositions resulting from a finding or admission of guilt or a plea of *nolo contendere* and juvenile adjudications.”;

by redesignating Notes 5 through 10 as Notes 4 through 9, respectively;

by inserting at the beginning of Note 4 (as so redesignated) the following new heading: “*Application of Subsection (d).*—”;

by inserting at the beginning of Note 5 (as so redesignated) the following new heading: “*Application of Subsection (e).*—”;

by inserting at the beginning of Note 6 (as so redesignated) the following new heading: “*Departures Based on Specific Treatment Purpose.*—”;

by inserting at the beginning of Note 7 (as so redesignated) the following new heading: “*Use of Substitutes for Imprisonment.*—”;

by inserting at the beginning of Note 8 (as so redesignated) the following new heading: “*Residential Treatment Program.*—”;

Amendment 821

by inserting at the beginning of Note 9 (as so redesignated) the following new heading: “*Application of Subsection (f).*—”;

and by inserting at the end the following new Note 10:

“10. *Zero-Point Offenders.*—

- (A) *Zero-Point Offenders in Zones A and B of the Sentencing Table.*—If the defendant received an adjustment under §4C1.1 (Adjustment for Certain Zero-Point Offenders) and the defendant’s applicable guideline range is in Zone A or B of the Sentencing Table, a sentence other than a sentence of imprisonment, in accordance with subsection (b) or (c)(3), is generally appropriate. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 994(j).
- (B) *Departure for Cases Where the Applicable Guideline Range Overstates the Gravity of the Offense.*—A departure, including a departure to a sentence other than a sentence of imprisonment, may be appropriate if the defendant received an adjustment under §4C1.1 (Adjustment for Certain Zero-Point Offenders) and the defendant’s applicable guideline range overstates the gravity of the offense because the offense of conviction is not a crime of violence or an otherwise serious offense. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 994(j).”.

Subpart 3 (Additional Changes)

Chapter One, Part A is amended in Subpart 1(4)(d) (Probation and Split Sentences)—

by adding an asterisk after “community confinement or home detention.”;

by adding a second asterisk after “through departures.*”;

and by striking the following Note:

“*Note: Although the Commission had not addressed ‘single acts of aberrant behavior’ at the time the Introduction to the Guidelines Manual originally was written, it subsequently addressed the issue in Amendment 603, effective November 1, 2000. (*See* USSG App. C, amendment 603.)”,

and inserting the following Notes:

“*Note: The Commission expanded Zones B and C of the Sentencing Table in 2010 to provide a greater range of sentencing options to courts with respect to certain offenders. (*See* USSG App. C, amendment 738.) In 2018, the Commission added a new application note to the Commentary to §5C1.1 (Imposition of a Term of Imprisonment), stating that if a defendant is a ‘nonviolent first offender and the applicable guideline range is in Zone A or B of the Sentencing Table, the court should consider imposing a sentence other than a sentence of imprisonment.’ (*See* USSG App. C, amendment 801.) In 2023, the Commission added a new Chapter Four guideline, at §4C1.1 (Adjustment for Certain Zero-Point Offenders), providing a decrease of 2 levels from the offense level determined under Chapters Two and Three for ‘zero-point’ offenders who meet certain criteria. In addition, the Commission further amended the Commentary to §5C1.1 to address the alternatives to incarceration available to ‘zero-point’ offenders by revising the application note in §5C1.1 that addressed ‘nonviolent first offenders’ to focus on ‘zero-point’ offenders. (*See* USSG App. C, amendment 821.)

****Note:** Although the Commission had not addressed ‘single acts of aberrant behavior’ at the time the Introduction to the Guidelines Manual originally was written, it subsequently addressed the issue in Amendment 603, effective November 1, 2000. (See USSG App. C, amendment 603.)”.

Section 4A1.3(b)(2)(A) is amended by striking “A departure” and inserting “Unless otherwise specified, a departure”.

The Commentary to §4A1.3 captioned “Application Notes” is amended in Note 3 by striking “due to the fact that the lower limit of the guideline range for Criminal History Category I is set for a first offender with the lowest risk of recidivism” and inserting “unless otherwise specified”.

Part C (Impact of Simple Possession of Marihuana Offenses)

The Commentary to §4A1.3 captioned “Application Notes”, as amended by Part B, Subpart 3 of this amendment, is further amended in Note 3 by striking the following:

“Downward Departures.—A downward departure from the defendant’s criminal history category may be warranted if, for example, the defendant had two minor misdemeanor convictions close to ten years prior to the instant offense and no other evidence of prior criminal behavior in the intervening period. A departure below the lower limit of the applicable guideline range for Criminal History Category I is prohibited under subsection (b)(2)(A), unless otherwise specified.”,

and inserting the following:

“Downward Departures.—

- (A) *Examples.—*A downward departure from the defendant’s criminal history category may be warranted based on any of the following circumstances:
 - (i) The defendant had two minor misdemeanor convictions close to ten years prior to the instant offense and no other evidence of prior criminal behavior in the intervening period.
 - (ii) The defendant received criminal history points from a sentence for possession of marihuana for personal use, without an intent to sell or distribute it to another person.
- (B) *Downward Departures from Criminal History Category I.—*A departure below the lower limit of the applicable guideline range for Criminal History Category I is prohibited under subsection (b)(2)(A), unless otherwise specified.”.

REASON FOR AMENDMENT: This amendment is the result of several Commission studies regarding the nature of the criminal history of federal offenders, including analyses of the number and types of prior convictions included as criminal history and the ability of the criminal history rules to predict an offender’s likelihood of rearrest. While these studies continue to recognize the close association between an offender’s criminal history calculation under the guidelines and the likelihood of future recidivism, the amendment makes targeted changes to reduce the impact of providing additional criminal history points for offenders under a criminal justice sentence (commonly known as “status points”), to reduce recommended guideline ranges for offenders with zero criminal history points under the guidelines (“zero-point offend-

Amendment 821

ers”), and to recognize the changing legal landscape as it pertains to simple possession of marijuana offenses. These targeted amendments balance the Commission’s mission of implementing data-driven sentencing policies with its duty to craft penalties that reflect the statutory purposes of sentencing.

Part A – Status Points

Part A of the amendment addresses “status points” for offenders, namely the additional criminal history points given to offenders for the fact of having committed the instant offense while under a criminal justice sentence, including probation, parole, supervised release, imprisonment, work release, or escape status. The amendment redesignates current subsection (d) of §4A1.1, which addresses “status points,” as subsection (e) and redesignates current subsection (e), which addresses multiple crimes of violence treated as a single sentence, as subsection (d). This redesignation is made for ease of application.

Under the previous “status points” provision, two criminal history points were added under §4A1.1(d) if the defendant committed the instant offense “while under any criminal justice sentence, including probation, parole, supervised release, imprisonment, work release, or escape status.” The amendment limits the overall criminal history impact of “status points” in two ways. First, as revised, the “status points” provision under redesignated subsection (e) applies only to offenders with more serious criminal histories under the guidelines by requiring that an offender have seven or more criminal history points under subsections (a) through (d) in addition to having been under a criminal justice sentence at the time of the instant offense. Offenders with six or fewer criminal history points under subsections (a) through (d) will no longer receive “status points.” Second, the amendment also reduces from two points to one point the “status points” assessed for offenders to whom the revised provision applies. Part A of the amendment also makes conforming changes to the Commentary to §4A1.1, §2P1.1 (Escape, Instigating or Assisting Escape), and §4A1.2 (Definitions and Instructions for Computing Criminal History).

As part of its study of criminal history, the Commission found that “status points” are relatively common in cases with at least one criminal history point, having been applied in 37.5 percent of cases with criminal history points over the last five fiscal years. Of the offenders who received “status points,” 61.5 percent had a higher Criminal History Category as a result of the addition of the “status points.” The Commission also recently published a series of research reports regarding the recidivism rates of federal offenders. *See, e.g.,* U.S. SENT’G COMM’N, RECIDIVISM OF FEDERAL OFFENDERS RELEASED IN 2010 (2021), available at <https://www.ussc.gov/research/research-reports/recidivism-federal-offenders-released-2010>. These reports again concluded that an offender’s criminal history calculation under the guidelines is strongly associated with the likelihood of future recidivism by the defendant. In a related publication, the Commission also found, however, that status points add little to the overall predictive value associated with the criminal history score. *See* U.S. SENT’G COMM’N, REVISITING STATUS POINTS (2022), available at <https://www.ussc.gov/research/research-reports/revisiting-status-points>.

The Commission’s action to limit the impact of “status points” builds upon its tradition of data-driven evolution of the guidelines. As described in the Introduction to Chapter Four, the original Commission envisioned status points as “consistent with the extant empirical research assessing correlates of recidivism and patterns of career criminal behavior” and therefore envisioned “status points” as being reflective of, among other sentencing goals, the increased likelihood of future recidivism. *See* USSG Ch.4, Pt.A, intro. comment. The original Commission also explained, however, that it would “review additional data insofar as they become available in the future.” The Commission’s recent research suggests that “status points” improve the

predictive value of the criminal history score less than the original Commission may have expected, suggesting that the treatment of “status points” under Chapter Four should be refined.

Accordingly, the Commission determined that it was appropriate to address several concerns regarding the scope and impact of status points. In taking these steps, the Commission observed that the operation of the *Guidelines Manual* separately accounts for consecutive punishment imposed upon revocations of supervised release, a likely occurrence if an offender was under a criminal justice sentence during the commission of another offense. The Commission further recognized that it is also possible that an offender’s criminal history score would be independently increased as the result of additional time imposed as the result of a revocation of probation or supervised release for the offense that also results in the addition of status points.

At the same time, by retaining “status points” for those offenders in higher criminal history categories, the Commission continues to recognize that “status points,” like the other criminal history provisions in Chapter Four, reflect and serve multiple purposes of sentencing, including the offender’s perceived lack of respect for the law, as reflected both in the offender’s overall criminal history and the fact that the offender has reoffended while under a criminal justice sentence ordered by a court. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)(A)–(C).

The Commission concluded that accounting for status on a more limited basis continues to serve the broader purposes of sentencing while also addressing other concerns raised regarding the impact of status points.

Part B – Zero-Point Offenders

Part B of the amendment includes three subparts making changes pertaining to offenders who did not receive any criminal history points from Chapter Four, Part A. Subpart 1 provides for an adjustment for certain offenders with zero criminal history points. Subpart 2 revises §5C1.1 (Imposition of a Term of Imprisonment) to implement the congressional directive at 28 U.S.C. § 994(j). Finally, Subpart 3 makes other conforming changes.

Subpart 1 – Adjustment for Certain Zero-Point Offenders

Subpart 1 of Part B of the amendment creates a new Chapter Four guideline at §4C1.1 (Adjustment for Certain Zero-Point Offenders). New §4C1.1 provides a decrease of two levels from the offense level determined under Chapters Two and Three for offenders who did not receive any criminal history points under Chapter Four, Part A and whose instant offense did not involve specified aggravating factors. In establishing new §4C1.1, the Commission was informed by its studies of recidivism among federal offenders, as well as other extensive data analyses of offenders with no criminal history points, and public comment. The Sentencing Table in Chapter Five, Part A is divided into six criminal history categories, from I (lowest) to VI (highest). Criminal History Category I includes offenders with zero criminal history points and those with one criminal history point. Recidivism data analyzed by the Commission shows, however, that offenders with zero criminal history points have considerably lower recidivism rates than other offenders, including offenders with one criminal history point. *See* U.S. SENT’G COMM’N, *RECIDIVISM OF FEDERAL OFFENDERS RELEASED IN 2010* (2021), available at <https://www.ussc.gov/research/research-reports/recidivism-federal-offenders-released-2010>. Among other findings, the report concluded that “zero-point offenders” were less likely to be rearrested than “one point” offenders (26.8% compared to 42.3%), the largest variation of any comparison of offenders within the same Criminal History Category.

In promulgating this change, the Commission also considered the rates of departures and variances in cases involving offenders with no criminal history points. The Commission has long

Amendment 821

viewed the rates and extents of departures and variances from the applicable guideline ranges as a feedback mechanism from the courts that a particular area of the guidelines may warrant further review and possible amendment. In fiscal year 2021, 39.2 percent of offenders with zero criminal history points received a sentence within the guidelines range; by comparison, 47.4 percent of offenders with one criminal history point were sentenced within the guideline range. The Commission determined that the departure and variance rates for zero-point offenders, coupled with its recidivism data, warranted action.

The amendment applies to offenders with no criminal history points, including (1) offenders with no prior convictions; (2) offenders who have prior convictions that are not counted because those convictions were not within the time limits set forth in subsection (d) and (e) of §4A1.2 (Definitions and Instructions for Computing Criminal History); and (3) offenders who have prior convictions that are not used in computing the criminal history category for reasons other than their “staleness” (*e.g.*, sentences resulting from foreign or tribal court convictions, minor misdemeanor convictions, or infractions). In adopting this definition of “zero-point offenders,” the Commission opted to hew to the long-standing and carefully crafted criminal history rules set forth in Chapter Four, regarding which prior convictions count for criminal history purposes and which do not. The Commission also observed that attempts to exclude offenders with certain prior convictions could lead to increased complexity and litigation and require the additional practical step of investigating prior unscorable offenses for which records may not be readily available.

While determining that a reduction is appropriate for some offenders with zero criminal history points, the Commission also identified circumstances in which zero-point offenders are appropriately excluded from eligibility in light of the seriousness of the instant offense of conviction or the existence of aggravating factors in the instant offense (*e.g.*, where the offender used violence or credible threats of violence in connection with the offense or where the instant offense of conviction was a “sex offense”). The exclusionary criteria identified by the Commission were again informed by extensive data analyses and public comment. The Commission was also informed by existing legislation, including the congressionally established criteria for the statutory safety valve at 18 U.S.C. § 3553(f) and the recent firearms legislation set forth in the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

Subpart 2 – Implementation of 28 U.S.C. § 994(j)

Subpart 2 of Part B of the amendment revises the Commentary to §5C1.1 (Imposition of a Term of Imprisonment) that addresses “nonviolent first offenders.” New Application Note 10(A) provides that if the defendant received an adjustment under new §4C1.1 and the defendant’s applicable guideline range is in Zone A or B of the Sentencing Table, a sentence other than a sentence of imprisonment, in accordance with subsection (b) or (c)(3), is generally appropriate. New Application Note 10(B) adds a corresponding departure provision providing that a departure, including a departure to a sentence other than a sentence of imprisonment, may be appropriate if the offender received an adjustment under new §4C1.1 and the applicable guideline range overstates the gravity of the offense because the offense of conviction is not a crime of violence or an otherwise serious offense.

The changes to the Commentary to §5C1.1 respond to Congress’s directive to the Commission at 28 U.S.C. § 994(j), directing the Commission to ensure that the guidelines reflect the general appropriateness of imposing a sentence other than imprisonment in cases in which the defendant is a first offender who has not been convicted of a crime of violence or an otherwise serious offense. The Commission determined that the revised commentary serves Congress’s intent in promulgating section 994(j) while providing appropriate limitations and guidance through reliance on the criteria set forth in new §4C1.1 and the specific statutory language set forth in section 994(j).

Subpart 3 – Additional Changes

Subpart 3 of Part B of the amendment makes a corresponding change to subsection (b)(2)(A) of §4A1.3 (Departures Based on Inadequacy of Criminal History Category (Policy Statement)) to provide that a departure below the lower limit of the applicable guideline range for Criminal History Category I is prohibited, “unless otherwise specified.” The amendment also revises an explanatory note in Chapter One, Part A, Subpart 1(4)(d) (Probation and Split Sentences) to detail amendments to the *Guidelines Manual* related to the implementation of 28 U.S.C. § 994(j), first offenders, and “zero-point offenders.”

Part C – Impact of Simple Possession of Marihuana Offenses

Part C of the amendment revises the Commentary to §4A1.3 (Departures Based on Inadequacy of Criminal History Category (Policy Statement)) to include sentences resulting from possession of marihuana offenses as an example of when a downward departure from the defendant’s criminal history may be warranted. Specifically, Part C provides that a downward departure may be warranted if the defendant received criminal history points from a sentence for possession of marihuana for personal use, without an intent to sell or distribute it to another person. Most commenters, including the Department of Justice, supported this change. See Letter from Jonathan J. Wroblewski, Dir., Crim. Div., U.S. Dep’t of Just., to Hon. Carlton W. Reeves, Chair, U.S. Sent’g Comm’n (Feb. 27, 2023), in U.S. SENT’G COMM’N, 2022–2023 AMENDMENT CYCLE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS/PUBLIC COMMENT (2023); see also U.S. SENT’G COMM’N, 2022–2023 AMENDMENT CYCLE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS/PUBLIC COMMENT (2023) (providing numerous public comment supporting the amendment).

The Commission also relied upon its recently published report on the impact of simple possession of marihuana offenses on sentencing. See U.S. SENT’G COMM’N, WEIGHING THE IMPACT OF SIMPLE POSSESSION OF MARIJUANA: TRENDS AND SENTENCING IN THE FEDERAL SYSTEM (2023), available at <https://www.ussc.gov/research/research-reports/weighing-impact-simple-possession-marijuana>. In that study, the Commission found that 4,405 federal offenders (8.0%) received criminal history points under the federal sentencing guidelines for prior marihuana possession sentences in fiscal year 2021. Most such prior sentences were for state court convictions resulting in less than 60 days in prison or non-custodial sentences. The Commission also found informative that ten percent (10.2%) of these 4,405 offenders had no other criminal history points, and that for 40 percent (40.1%) of the 4,405 offenders (1,765), the criminal history points for prior marihuana possession sentences resulted in a higher Criminal History Category.

Effective Date: The effective date of this amendment is November 1, 2023.

AMENDMENT 822

AMENDMENT: The Commentary to §2L1.2 captioned “Application Notes” is amended in Note 2, in the paragraph that begins “‘Crime of violence’ means”, by inserting after “territorial jurisdiction of the United States.” the following: “‘Robbery’ is the unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property from the person or in the presence of another, against his will, by means of actual or threatened force, or violence, or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, or property in his custody or possession, or the person or property of a relative or member of his family or of anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining. The phrase ‘actual or threatened force’ refers to force that is sufficient to overcome a victim’s resistance.”.