

27a

APPENDIX C

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-18
(8:98-cr-00520-PJM-2)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT

v.

DUSTIN JOHN HIGGS, DEFENDANT-APPELLEE

Filed: Jan. 7, 2021

ORDER

Upon consideration of the government's opening brief and the defendant's response brief, the court directs the clerk to schedule this case for remote oral argument on January 27, 2021, at 11:00 a.m. The parties may file any motions pertaining to the scheduling of argument by January 8, 2021.

Entered at the direction of Judge Keenan with the concurrence of Judge Floyd. Judge Richardson dissented from the order and filed a dissenting opinion.

For the Court

/s/ PATRICIA S. CONNOR, Clerk
PATRICIA S. CONNOR

RICHARDSON, Circuit Judge, dissenting:

I respectfully dissent from the order delaying this case to schedule oral argument on January 27. Argument and more time for deliberation can be helpful, particularly in weighty matters like this one. But the Executive Branch scheduled Higgs's execution for January 15. And the parties agreed to an expedited briefing schedule to permit consideration of a single question of statutory interpretation before that date. *See* Fourth Circuit I.O.P. 22.1.

Respecting the Executive's prerogative to carry out duly imposed capital sentences, the Supreme Court acts with dispatch when a district court bars a scheduled execution. *See Barr v. Hall*, No. 20A102, 2020 WL 6797719 (U.S. Nov. 19, 2020) (mem.); *Barr v. Lee*, 140 S. Ct. 2590 (2020); *Barr v. Purkey*, 140 S. Ct. 2594 (2020) (mem.); *Barr v. Purkey*, 141 S. Ct. 196 (2020) (mem.). There is no good reason why we cannot do the same. So I respectfully dissent from the decision to delay this process to hear oral argument during our previously scheduled term of court, which falls two weeks after the scheduled execution.

APPENDIX D

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-18
(8:98-cr-00520-PJM-2)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT

v.

DUSTIN JOHN HIGGS, DEFENDANT-APPELLEE

Filed: Jan. 8, 2021

ORDER

Upon consideration of submissions relative to the government's motion to dispense with, or alternatively expedite, oral argument, the court denies the motion in light of the novel legal issues presented.

Entered at the direction of Judge Keenan with the concurrence of Judge Floyd. Judge Richardson dissented from the order and filed a dissenting opinion.

For the Court

/s/ PATRICIA S. CONNOR, Clerk
PATRICIA S. CONNOR

RICHARDSON, Circuit Judge, dissenting:

I continue to respectfully dissent from our decision to delay this case by scheduling oral argument two weeks *after* the scheduled execution. *See* Order, ECF 15, No. 20-18 (Jan. 7, 2020) (Richardson, J., dissenting). That decision frustrates the Executive's prerogative and ignores the Supreme Court's guidance, both of which provide good reason to decide with dispatch.