

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

United States v. Hernandez

Criminal No. 19-cr-370 (RDM) (D.D.C. Aug. 4, 2026) (Report and Recommendation) · No. Criminal No. 19-cr-370 (RDM) · Decided August 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The document is a Report and Recommendation addressing Eric Hernandez’s motion to terminate supervised release in a federal criminal case. The magistrate judge recommends finding that Hernandez violated the conditions of supervision, imposing a sentence of time served, and declining to impose any further supervision based on his rehabilitation, stable housing, employment, treatment, and the Probation Office’s consent.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Zia M. Faruqui
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	August 4, 2026
DOCKET	Criminal No. 19-cr-370 (RDM)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved to terminate supervised release after admitting two Grade C technical violations. The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the district court find the violations, impose a sentence of time served, and impose no further supervision.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	United States of America

TOPICS

- probation
- sentencing
- criminal procedure
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- sentencing
- supervised release
- probation
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should terminate or decline to impose any further supervised release after Hernandez admitted two remaining Grade C technical violations.
2. Whether, in resolving the supervised-release violations, the court should focus on forward-looking sentencing purposes such as rehabilitation, deterrence, and public safety rather than retribution.

HOLDINGS

1. Given that supervised release had expired, Hernandez had completed treatment, obtained stable housing and employment, remained drug free, posed no apparent danger to the community, and had the Probation Office's consent, the court recommended finding the violations but imposing time served with no further period of supervision.
2. The Maryland matter did not support additional punishment because it had been resolved without a new conviction, and the Probation Office sought to proceed only on the two technical violations.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“the primary purpose of supervised release is to facilitate the integration of offenders back into the community rather than punish them.” (4)

“supervised release fulfills rehabilitative ends, distinct from those served by incarceration.” (4)

“There is no indication of how additional punishment furthers deterrence.” (5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hernandez was serving supervised release after a firearm-possession conviction and experienced repeated compliance problems, including failed drug testing, failure to participate in treatment, failure to report, and failure to obtain employment. His supervision was scheduled to expire on September 21, 2024, but an outstanding warrant led to his arrest in July 2026. In the intervening period, he voluntarily completed a year-long substance-abuse treatment program, obtained stable housing with his family, avoided conviction in the pending Maryland matter, became drug free, and obtained employment.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hernandez pleaded guilty to violating 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) and received seven months of imprisonment and twenty-four months of supervised release. During supervision, the Probation Office filed multiple violation petitions, and Hernandez admitted violations in March 2022 and July 2023. After later violations, an arrest warrant was issued; following his July 2026 arrest, Hernandez moved to terminate supervision. The Probation Office consented, and the magistrate judge recommended granting the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- United States v. Johnson, 529 U.S. 53, 59 (2000)
- Esteras v. United States, 606 U.S. 185, 186 (2025)
- United States v. Nwenz, No. 19-cr-285, 2024 WL 4608867, at *4 (D.D.C. 2024)
- United States v. Bryant, 778 F. Supp. 3d 14, 22 n.7 (D.D.C. 2025)
- United States v. Mosley, 312 F. Supp. 3d 1289, 1294 (M.D. Ala. 2018)

OPINION

United States v. Hernandez

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff, No. 19-cr-370 (RDM) v.

ERIC HERNANDEZ,

Defendant.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is Defendant's Motion to Terminate Supervision. See ECF No. 65. For the reasons stated below, the court recommends GRANTING the motion.

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On March 3, 2021, Mr. Hernandez pled guilty to Unlawful Possession of a Firearm and Ammunition by a Person Previously Convicted of Crime Punishable by Imprisonment for a Term Exceeding One Year in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). See Sentencing Memorandum 4, ECF No. 38. This conviction resulted in a sentence of seven months of incarceration, twenty-four months of supervised release, and \$100 special assessment. See Judgment 2–3, 6, ECF No. 41. His special conditions of release included educational services programming, vocational services programming, substance abuse treatment and testing, and reentry progress hearing. See *id.* at 4. On August 5, 2021, the Probation Office filed a petition, alleging that Mr. Hernandez had not submitted a DNA sample or paid his special assessment, failed to comply with random urinalysis, and failed to follow instructions given by the probation office. See U.S. Probation Office Pet., Reentry Progress Report 1–2, ECF No. 43. On August 10, 2021, Judge Moss issued a summons for a Reentry Progress Hearing. See *id.* On August 30, 2021, Judge Moss held the 1 Reentry Progress Hearing. Judge Moss reminded Mr. Hernandez about the importance of complying with the conditions of supervision. On November 23, 2021, the Probation Office filed a petition with three new alleged violations. See U.S. Probation Office Pet., Statement of Alleged Violations of Supervised Release/Pet. for Warrant 1–2, ECF No. 48. First, Mr. Hernandez submitted a urine specimen which tested positive for narcotics. See *id.* at 1. Second, Mr. Hernandez failed to attend weekly substance abuse meetings and left a treatment facility without authorization. See *id.* at 2. Mr. Hernandez told his probation officer that he left due to symptoms related to narcotics

withdrawal. See *id.* at 4. Third, Mr. Hernandez failed to report to the Probation Office and was homeless with his whereabouts unknown. See *id.* at 2, 4. On November 30, 2021, Judge Moss issued an arrest warrant based on these violations. On March 17, 2022, Mr. Hernandez conceded to the three violations in the petition. See Minute Entry (Mar. 17, 2022). On March 22, 2022, Judge Moss ordered Mr. Hernandez's release from detention subject to a bed-to-bed transfer to a treatment center. See Order, ECF No. 50. On May 3, 2023, the Probation Office filed a petition alleging that Mr. Hernandez violated the conditions of his supervised release by failing to report for substance use testing, failing to refrain from the unlawful use of controlled substances, failing to participate in a substance abuse treatment program, failing to report to his probation officer, failing to obtain full-time employment, and failing to enroll in educational and vocational services programs. See U.S. Probation Office Pet., Statement of Alleged Violation of Supervised Release/Pet. for Summons 2–3, ECF No. 54. At the time, Mr. Hernandez was residing with his mother in a stable residence and remained unemployed. See *id.* at 4. On May 5, 2023, Judge Moss issued a summons and scheduled a hearing on violation. See Order, ECF No. 55. 2 On July 18, 2023, Judge Moss found that the defendant had violated the conditions of supervision and imposed a sanction of 90 days of location monitoring. See Minute Entry (Jul. 18, 2023). On November 20, 2023, the Probation Office filed a petition alleging that Mr. Hernandez again violated the conditions of his supervised release by failing to report for substance use testing, failing to participate in a substance abuse treatment program, failing to report to his probation officer, failing to obtain full-time employment, and failing to enroll in educational and vocational services programs. See U.S. Probation Office Pet., Statement of Alleged Violations of Supervised Release/Petition for Summons 2–3, ECF No. 59. At the time, Mr. Hernandez was still residing with his mother in a stable residence and remained unemployed. See *id.* at 4. On November 21, 2023, Judge Moss issued a summons in reference to this petition. See Order, ECF No. 60. On November 27, 2023, Maryland law enforcement arrested Mr. Hernandez. See U.S. Probation Office Pet., Statement of Additional Alleged Violations of Supervised Release/Pet. for Summons 4, ECF No. 61. A search incident to arrest revealed that Mr. Hernandez was in possession of oxycodone and cocaine. See *id.* The Maryland court released Mr. Hernandez on his own recognizance. See *id.* The court scheduled trial for January 18, 2024. See *id.* On December 11, 2023, the Probation Office filed a petition noting this new arrest. See *id.* at 1–2. On January 31, 2024, Mr. Hernandez failed to appear for his hearing, and the hearing was rescheduled for February 23, 2024. See Minute Order (Feb. 1, 2024). On February 23, 2024, Mr. Hernandez again failed to appear for his hearing. See Minute Entry (Feb. 23, 2024). Judge Moss issued an arrest warrant. See *id.* On July 9, 2026, Mr. Hernandez was travelling in an Uber which law enforcement stopped for a traffic violation. See ECF No. 65 at 2. Law enforcement arrested Mr. Hernandez during the 3 stop based on the outstanding warrant. See *id.* On July 9, 2026, Mr. Hernandez appeared before the undersigned for a return on arrest warrant and detention hearing. See Minute Order (Jul. 9, 2026). The Probation Office did not seek his detention, and the Court ordered his

release. See *id.* On July 13, 2026, Mr. Hernandez filed a motion to terminate supervision. See Mem. in Support of Request for Termination of Supervision, ECF No. 65. On July 14, 2026, the Court held a hearing on the motion. The Probation Office consented to the request, and the government deferred to the Probation Office. See *id.* at 1.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Mr. Hernandez's Progress The Court's main question was: where has Mr. Hernandez been for the past two years? His answer was impressive. On April 15, 2024, Mr. Hernandez entered treatment at the Priceless Hearts Behavioral Health Center substance abuse program in Baltimore, Maryland. See ECF No. 65 at 1–2. Mr. Hernandez chose the program in part to get away from negative social influences in the D.C. area. See *id.* at 1. Mr. Hernandez remained in the program for one year. See *id.* at 2. The program provided him with housing during this time. See *id.* Ultimately, Mr. Hernandez “resolved the pending [Maryland] matter by Zoom, and he was not convicted of any new offense.” *Id.* In June 2025, Mr. Hernandez obtained an apartment in Baltimore. He lives there with his wife and their nine-year-old daughter. See *id.* Mr. Hernandez also obtained a job at Petco. Because he was unable to get full-time shifts there, he continued to look for other employment. See *id.* In 1 Mr. Hernandez stated that he subsequently went to the D.C. Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA) to check the status on his supervision. CSOSA had no record of his supervision. Mr. Hernandez mistakenly understood this to mean that his supervision was complete. 4 July 2026, he obtained a full-time position with a landscaping company. See *id.* He currently works both jobs to support himself and his family. See *id.* At bottom, “the primary purpose of supervised release is to facilitate the integration of offenders back into the community rather than punish them.” U.S. Sent’g Comm’n, Federal Offenders Sentenced to Supervised Release (2010) (“Supervised Release Report”) 9. Indeed, “[s]upervised release fulfills rehabilitative ends, distinct from those served by incarceration.” *United States v. Johnson*, 529 U.S. 53, 59 (2000). Thus, when a “defendant violates a condition of supervised release, courts must consider the forward-looking sentencing ends, but may not consider the backward-looking purpose of retribution.” *Esteras v. United States*, 606 U.S. 185, 186 (2025) (holding that a district court may not revoke supervised release based on a belief that the defendant’s original sentence was lenient).

B. Resolving the Current Petition Because the underlying Maryland case was resolved, the Probation Office only sought to move forward with the two technical violations. Both were Grade C violations. Mr. Hernandez admitted both violations and asked for the termination of his supervision. Mr. Hernandez’s supervision has reached the end of its useful lifespan. His supervision was set to expire on September 21, 2024. Since the filing of the petition, Mr. Hernandez has gotten his life together. There are no further resources the Probation Office needs to offer Mr. Hernandez. He has stable housing, is fully employed, and is drug free. Should he need further support, he can seek that on his own. See Status Hearing (Jul. 14, 2026). Indeed, he enrolled in the year-long treatment program of his own volition. Mr. Hernandez’s sustained streak of lawful behavior is the best evidence that he is not a

risk to public safety necessitating deterrence. And “[t]here is no indication of how additional 5 punishment furthers deterrence.” *United States v. Nwenzé*, No. 19-cr-285, 2024 WL 4608867, at *4 (D.D.C. 2024). In fact, further incarceration endangers Mr. Hernandez and the public. See *United States v. Bryant*, 778 F. Supp. 3d 14, 22 n.7 (D.D.C. 2025) (discussing how “[e]xposure to the specific and general harms . . . detainees experience can result in long-lasting trauma”); Katie Rose Quandt and Alexi Jones, Research Roundup: Incarceration Can Cause Lasting Damage to Mental Health, Prison Pol’y Initiative (May 13, 2021), <https://perma.cc/N6C2-8UWF> (examining how experiencing or witnessing violence during incarceration was significantly related to “aggressive and antisocial behavioral tendencies as well as emotional distress”). And further incarceration would derail whatever progress he has made over the prior years. See *United States v. Mosley*, 312 F. Supp. 3d 1289, 1294 (M.D. Ala. 2018).

III. CONCLUSION

Given that Mr. Hernandez’s period of supervision was set to expire on September 21, 2024, he appears to pose no danger to the community, he completed a lengthy treatment program, he took responsibility for the Grade C violations, and based on the Probation Office’s consent: the undersigned recommends a finding that Mr. Hernandez violated his conditions of release, sentence him to a period of time served, and not impose any further period of supervision.² Zia Digitally signed by Zia M.Faruqui Date: August 4, 2026 M.Faruqui Date: 2026.08.04 13:18:09 -04'00'

ZIA M. FARUQUI

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

² Per the Probation Office, no hearing is needed to adopt this Recommendation, as no additional supervision is ordered. Adoption of the Report and Recommendation would close this case. 6