

To the extent the government continues to make that argument, we have since rejected it—as Lawson correctly points out in Rule 28(j) letters to which the government has not responded. Most recently, in *United States v. Ware*, 964 F.3d 482, 488 (6th Cir. 2020), we held that, in deciding whether to grant a defendant’s motion under the First Step Act, the district court may

No. 19-4255, *United States v. Lawson*

consider—as simply a “factor” under 18 U.S.C. § 3553—that the defendant was sentenced based in part on what would now be considered a legal mistake.

The law as to the First Step Act has evolved rapidly in our circuit since the district court entered its most recent opinion in this case. Understandably, then, the district court’s opinion does not make clear whether the district court understood that it had authority to consider Lawson’s arguments based on intervening changes in the law. *See* December 9, 2019 Opinion at 4 n.3. We will therefore vacate the district court’s December 2019 opinion and remand for the limited purpose of allowing the district court to consider those arguments and to recite its reasoning as to them. *Cf. Ware*, 964 F.3d at 489.

The district court’s December 2019 Opinion is vacated, and the case is remanded for proceedings consistent with this opinion.