

[\*\*Torres v. Madrid, 141 S. Ct. 989 \(2021\)\*\*](#) (Arising from a civil lawsuit, the Court considered whether a seizure occurs when an officer shoots someone who temporarily eludes capture after the shooting. The Court answered in the affirmative, holding that “[t]he application of physical force to the body of a person with intent to restrain is a seizure, even if the force does not succeed in subduing the person.”)

[\*\*United States v. Mayweather, 991 F.3d 1163 \(11th Cir. 2021\)\*\*](#) (The Court reversed Hobbs Act extortion convictions for four defendants because of reversible errors in the jury instructions. First, the district court erred in failing to give an entrapment jury instruction for two defendants because there was sufficient evidence produced to raise the issue of government inducement. Second, the district court erred in failing to instruct the jury on the definition of “official act” for purposes of the Hobbs Act extortion charges.)

[\*\*United States v. Pendergrass, No. 19-13681, 2021 WL 1115426 \(11th Cir. Mar. 24, 2021\)\*\*](#) (Among other issues, the Court considered whether 28 U.S.C. § 1863 excludes from jury service a supervision officer who was POST-certified. The Court interpreted § 1863 to exclude a person who “function[s] [a] a police officer, not a member of any organization that could fall under the broad umbrella of law enforcement.”)

[\*\*United States v. Elysee, No. 18-14214, 2021 WL 1310551 \(11th Cir. Apr. 8, 2021\)\*\*](#) (Among other issues, the Court held that evidence of whether a law enforcement officer’s conduct fell below the reasonable officer standard of performance was not relevant to whether the defendant violated 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). And even if it was an issue in the case, the Court held that the evidence would have been inadmissible under Fed. R. Evid. 403.)