This Court explained in *Marks v. United States*, 430 U.S. 188, 193 (1977), that "[w]hen a fragmented Court decides a case and no single rationale explaining the result enjoys the assent of five Justices, 'the holding of the Court may be viewed as that position taken by those Members who concurred in the judgments on the narrowest grounds.'" In *Freeman v. United States*, 564 U.S. 522 (2011), the Court issued a fractured 4-1-4 decision concluding that a defendant who enters into a plea agreement under Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(c)(1)(C) may be eligible for a reduction in his sentence if the Sentencing Commission subsequently issues a retroactive amendment to the Sentencing Guidelines. But the four-Justice plurality and Justice Sotomayor's concurrence shared no common rationale and the courts of appeals have divided over how to apply *Freeman*'s result.

The questions presented are:

1. Whether this Court's decision in *Marks* means that the concurring opinion in a 4-1-4 decision represents the holding of the Court where neither the plurality's reasoning nor the concurrence's reasoning is a logical subset of the other.

2. Whether, under *Marks*, the lower courts are bound by the four-Justice plurality opinion in *Freeman*, or, instead, by Justice Sotomayor's separate concurring opinion with which all eight other Justices disagreed.

3. Whether, as the four-Justice plurality in Freeman concluded, a defendant who enters into a Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(c)(1)(C) plea agreement is generally eligible for a sentence reduction if there is a later, retroactive amendment to the relevant Sentencing Guidelines range.