

**List of Supreme Court criminal cases
Decided during October 2025 term**

***Abouammo v. United States*, No. 25-5146 (Jun. 11, 2026)**

Holding

A defendant charged with knowingly falsifying a document with the intent to obstruct a federal investigation in violation of [18 U.S.C. § 1519](#) must be tried in the district where the falsification occurred; the defendant cannot be tried in a different district where the investigation was located because no “conduct constituting the offense” happened there.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/06/court-unanimously-sides-with-defendant-in-criminal-venue-dispute-over-where-a-crime-occurs/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/25-5146_e29f.pdf

***Barrett v. United States*, No. 24-5774 (Jan. 14, 2026)**

Holding

Congress did not clearly authorize convictions under both [18 U.S.C. § 924\(c\)](#) and [\(j\)](#) for a single act that violates both provisions – therefore, one act that violates both may spawn only one conviction; the part of the 2nd Circuit’s judgment that held otherwise is reversed.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/01/court-unanimously-holds-that-double-jeopardy-bars-convictions-for-two-firearm-offenses/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-5774new_f20h.pdf

***Bowe v. United States*, No. 24-5438 (Jan. 9, 2026)**

Holding

[Title 28 U.S.C. § 2244\(b\)\(1\)](#) does not bar the Supreme Court’s review of a federal prisoner’s request to file a second or successive [Section 2255](#) motion for postconviction relief, and [Subsection 2244\(b\)\(1\)](#) does not apply to second or successive motions filed under [Section 2255\(h\)](#) by federal prisoners challenging their convictions or sentences.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/01/bare-court-majority-sides-with-federal-inmate-on-questions-of-habeas-procedure/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-5438_o7kq.pdf

Case v. Montana, No. 24-624 (Jan. 14, 2026)

Holding

Under the standard set in *Brigham City v. Stuart*, the Fourth Amendment allows police officers to enter a home without a warrant if they have an “objectively reasonable basis for believing” that someone inside needs emergency assistance; that standard was met here.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/01/court-finds-police-properly-entered-mans-home-despite-absence-of-a-warrant/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-624_b07d.pdf

Chatrie v. United States, No. 25-112 (Jun. 29, 2026)

Holding

Police officers conducted a Fourth Amendment search when they acquired Okello Chatrie’s location data from Google because an individual has a reasonable expectation of privacy in his cell-phone location information.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/06/court-rules-that-law-enforcements-use-of-geofence-warrant-was-a-search/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/25-112_oam4.pdf

Clark v. Sweeney, No. 25-52 (Nov. 24, 2025) (per curiam) (no argument)

Holding

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit departed from the principle of party presentation and abused its discretion in granting a new trial.

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/25-52_4gd5.pdf

***District of Columbia v. R.W.*, No. 25-248 (Apr. 28, 2026) (per curiam) (no argument)**

Holding

Because the officer in this case clearly had reasonable suspicion to stop R.W., the judgment of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals is reversed, and the case is remanded.

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/25-248_8m58.pdf

***Ellingburg v. United States*, No. 24-482 (Jan. 20, 2026)**

Holding

Restitution under the [Mandatory Victims Restitution Act](#) of 1996 is criminal punishment for purposes of the Ex Post Facto Clause.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/01/justices-hold-that-restitution-requirements-imposed-on-federal-convicts-cant-be-ratcheted-up-after-the-crime-but-before-sentencing/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-482_d1oe.pdf

***Fernandez v. United States*, No. 24-556 (May 28, 2026)**

Holding

A prisoner who collaterally attacks the validity of his conviction must proceed through [28 U.S.C. § 2255](#), not [18 U.S.C. § 3582](#); the supposed invalidity of a conviction is not among the “extraordinary and compelling reasons” that justify compassionate release.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/06/court-rejects-broad-interpretation-of-compassionate-release-statute/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-556_8m58.pdf

***Hunter v. United States*, No. 24-1063 (Jun. 18, 2026)**

Holding

An agreement not to appeal a sentence is unenforceable when it would result in a miscarriage of justice — meaning, when it would leave in place the kind of egregious error that would bring the judicial system into disrepute.

[https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/06/court-determines-federal-defendants-appellate-waivers-unenforceable-if-a-miscarriage-of-justice-/](https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/06/court-determines-federal-defendants-appellate-waivers-unenforceable-if-a-miscarriage-of-justice/)

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-1063_5ifl.pdf

***Klein v. Martin*, No. 25-51 (Jan. 26, 2026) (per curiam) (decided without argument)**

Holding

Because the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit affirmed the award of a new trial based on reasoning that departed from the strict standards that govern the grant of federal habeas relief to prisoners convicted in state court prescribed by the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, the court grants the state’s petition for a writ of certiorari and reverses the judgment below.

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/25-51_4g15.pdf

***Landor v. Louisiana Department of Corrections and Public Safety*, No. 23, 1197 (Jun. 23, 2026)**

Holding

State employees may not be held liable in their personal capacities under a spending clause statute such as the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000 unless those individuals have voluntarily and knowingly consented to answer private suits under the statute; the individual defendants in this case did not do so here, so Damon Landor’s case cannot proceed against them.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/06/court-rules-former-louisiana-inmate-cannot-sue-prison-officials-in-religious-dispute-over-long-h/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/23-1197_h3ci.pdf

***McCarthy v. Hernandez*, No. 25-748 (Jun. 22, 2026) (per curiam) (no argument)**

Holding

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 2nd Circuit exceeded its authority in holding that Pedro Hernandez is entitled to habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1); no clearly established federal law required the trial court to instruct the jury about the rule that Justice Kennedy adopted in *Missouri v. Seibert*, and the 2nd Circuit erred in holding otherwise.

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/25-748_4g10.pdf

***Pitchford v. Cain*, No. 24-7351 (May 28, 2026)**

Holding

In Terry Pitchford’s direct appeal of a capital murder sentence, the Mississippi Supreme Court unreasonably applied the clearly established precedents of *Batson v. Kentucky* to determine that Pitchford waived his opportunity to rebut the prosecutor’s asserted race-neutral reasons for the peremptory strikes of four black prospective jurors.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/05/supreme-court-sides-with-death-row-inmate-in-challenge-to-racial-discrimination-in-jury-selectio/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-7351_jiel.pdf

***Pitts v. Mississippi*, No. 24-1159 (Nov. 24, 2025) (decided without argument) (per curiam)**

Holding

A defendant’s Sixth Amendment right to meet his accusers face to face may not be denied without case-specific findings of necessity, notwithstanding Mississippi’s right-to-screening statute.

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-1159_k536.pdf

***Rico v. United States*, No. 24-1056 (Mar. 25, 2026)**

Holding

The Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 does not authorize a rule automatically extending a defendant’s term of supervised release when the defendant fails to report to a probation officer.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/03/court-rejects-extension-of-federal-supervised-release-while-a-defendant-absconds/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-1056_qn12.pdf

***Rutherford v. United States*, No. 24-820 (May 28, 2026)**

Holding

When Congress declines to make a sentencing amendment retroactive, the resulting sentencing disparity cannot serve as an “extraordinary and compelling” reason that warrants a sentence reduction under [§3582\(c\)\(1\)\(A\)\(i\)](#).

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/06/court-rejects-broad-interpretation-of-compassionate-release-statute/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-820_97be.pdf

***United States v. Hemani*, No. 24-1234 (Jun. 18, 2026)**

Holding

Prosecution of Ali Hemani under [18 U.S.C. § 922\(g\)\(3\)](#) — for knowingly possessing a gun in his home while being an unlawful user of a controlled substance — is inconsistent with the Second Amendment.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/06/court-sides-with-challenger-to-law-banning-drug-users-from-possessing-guns/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-1234_g2bh.pdf

***Villareal v. Texas*, No. 24-557 (Feb. 25, 2026)**

Holding

A trial court’s qualified conferral order that prohibits only discussion of the defendant’s testimony for its own sake during a mid-testimony overnight recess permissibly balances the defendant’s Sixth Amendment right to counsel against the burden of offering unaltered trial testimony and does not violate the Constitution.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/02/court-rules-criminal-defendants-may-be-prohibited-from-discussing-ongoing-testimony-with-counsel-during-an-overnight-recess/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-557_l5gm.pdf

***Whitton v. Dixon*, No. 25-580((Jun. 1, 2026) (per curiam) (no argument)**

Holding

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit erred in considering post-trial DNA evidence when assessing whether the Florida Supreme Court reasonably determined that jailhouse informant Jake Ozio’s testimony was immaterial to the jury’s verdict, because evidence not presented to the jury could not have influenced the jury’s verdict and therefore sheds no light on whether Ozio’s testimony influenced that verdict.

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/25-580_o8m1.pdf

***Wolford v. Lopez*, No. 24-1046 (Jun. 25, 2026)**

Holding

Hawaii's law prohibiting licensed concealed-carry permit holders from carrying handguns on private property open to the public without the property owner's express authorization violates the Second and Fourteenth Amendments.

<https://www.scotusblog.com/2026/06/supreme-court-strikes-hawaii-gun-restriction/>

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/24-1046_nmio.pdf

***Zorn v. Linton*, No. 25-297 (Mar. 23, 2026) (per curiam) (no argument)**

Holding

Because the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 2nd Circuit failed to identify a case where an officer using a routine wristlock on a protester after issuing a verbal warning, without more, was held to have violated the Constitution, Sergeant Jacob Zorn was entitled to qualified immunity; the 2nd Circuit's contrary conclusion was erroneous.

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/25-297_bqm2.pdf

Criminal Cases Granted Review for October 2026 Term

Beaird v. United States, No. 25-5343

- Whether *Stinson v. United States* still correctly states the rule for deference that courts must give the Commentary of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines.

Maxwell v. Thomas, No. 25-5930

- Whether a claim regarding application of time credits under the First Step Act of 2018 seeking accelerated transfer to a halfway house or home confinement can be brought in a habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

Guerrero v. Johnson, No. 25-1003

- Whether a claim relies on a “new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable” when the habeas petitioner could have asserted a claim based on the rule in a prior federal habeas petition.

Kian v. Florida, No. 25-6623

- Whether the petitioner was deprived of his right, under the Sixth and 14th Amendments, to a trial by a 12-person jury when the defendant is charged with a serious felony.

Nielsen v. Watanabe, No. 25-417

- Whether the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit erred here in recognizing a Bivens cause of action.

Viramontes v. Cook County, No. 25-238

- Whether the Second and 14th Amendments guarantee the right to possess AR-15 platform and similar semiautomatic rifles.

Jouppi v. Alaska, No. 25-246

- Whether, in determining whether a fine contravenes the excessive fines clause – which holds the amount of the fine “must bear some relationship to the gravity of the offense that it is designed to punish” – courts may consider the gravity of the underlying offense purely in the abstract or should consider the gravity of the specific defendant’s wrongdoing.

