



---

2017 Decisions

Opinions of the United  
States Court of Appeals  
for the Third Circuit

---

12-4-2017

# USA v. Michael Young

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2017](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2017)

---

## Recommended Citation

"USA v. Michael Young" (2017). *2017 Decisions*. 1138.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2017/1138](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2017/1138)

This December is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2017 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu](mailto:Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu).

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 16-1728

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

MICHAEL YOUNG,

Appellant

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
(D.C. No. 2-14-cr-00183-002)  
District Judge: Honorable Michael M. Baylson

---

Submitted Under Third Circuit L.A.R. 34.1(a)  
October 11, 2017

Before: HARDIMAN, SHWARTZ, and ROTH, *Circuit Judges*.

(Filed: December 4, 2017)

---

OPINION\*

---

---

\* This disposition is not an opinion of the full Court and pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

HARDIMAN, *Circuit Judge*.

Michael Young appeals his judgment of conviction under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) for his participation in the armed robbery of a Philadelphia convenience store. We will affirm.

I<sup>1</sup>

In May 2015, Young was simultaneously convicted of Hobbs Act robbery, 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a), and using or carrying a firearm during a crime of violence, 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(1)(A). In this appeal, Young claims his Hobbs Act robbery conviction is not a crime of violence for purposes of § 924(c).

In *United States v. Robinson*, we recently held that a Hobbs Act robbery conviction qualifies as a crime of violence under § 924(c) when the convictions are contemporaneous. *See* 844 F.3d 137, 143–44 (3d Cir. 2016). This is so because, in those circumstances, the jury necessarily finds that the defendant used a firearm while committing Hobbs Act robbery. *Id.* at 144.

Just like Robinson, Young was found guilty of violating both the Hobbs Act and § 924(c). Because these charges were tried simultaneously before one jury, our inquiry “is not ‘is Hobbs Act robbery a crime of violence?’ but rather ‘is Hobbs Act robbery

---

<sup>1</sup> The District Court had jurisdiction under 18 U.S.C. § 3231. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. Because Young raises this issue for the first time on appeal, we review for plain error. *See United States v. Robinson*, 844 F.3d 137, 140 (3d Cir. 2016).

*committed while [using or carrying] a firearm a crime of violence?”* *Id.* We held in *Robinson* that “[t]he answer to this question must be yes.” *Id.* The fact that Young used a firearm instead of brandishing it (as *Robinson* did) does nothing to change this analysis.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, the District Court committed no error—plain or otherwise—in classifying Young’s Hobbs Act robbery as a crime of violence. For that reason, we will affirm Young’s judgment of conviction.

---

<sup>2</sup> While the defendant in *Robinson* was convicted of brandishing a firearm under § 924(c)(1)(A)(ii), the reasoning of that case extends to a § 924(c)(1)(A)(i) conviction where a jury finds that the defendant used or carried a gun. *See* 844 F.3d at 143–44.