

Inside Out — June 12, 2026: Rutherford's Reach, Camp Transfers Before Release, and a Death at USP Terre Haute

This issue covers three developments shaping federal custody and reentry this cycle. The Supreme Court's decision in *Rutherford v. United States* has clarified — and in most circuits, narrowed — what district courts may consider as 'extraordinary and compelling reasons' for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). The Bureau of Prisons (BOP) has announced a policy expanding transfers of eligible individuals to minimum-security camps in the months before release, a step BOP frames as a reentry tool. And USP Terre Haute, a high-security federal penitentiary in Indiana, has reported an in-custody death, prompting the standard notification and review process.

Alongside the deep dives, this issue surfaces a systemic pattern the publication is tracking: a Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General (OIG) report describing shortfalls in BOP implementation of the First Step Act (FSA), and a Supreme Court grant of certiorari in a pro se habeas case involving FSA time credits. Quick-hit sections cover halfway house transfers in high-profile cases, a federal court order on transgender housing, and a proposal to privatize BOP food service.

The practical tip this cycle addresses summer visitation logistics, with Juneteenth (June 19) and the observed Independence Day holiday (Friday, July 3) both falling inside the issue window and likely to affect institutional schedules. As always, every item is framed for what readers can do with the information.

THIS WEEK'S LEAD

Supreme Court's Rutherford Decision Narrows Compassionate Release Grounds in Most Circuits

Theme: compassionate release / Rutherford

On May 28, 2026, the Supreme Court decided *Rutherford v. United States*, addressing what a federal district court may consider when ruling on a motion for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). Compassionate release — formally a 'sentence reduction' motion — allows a federal prisoner, after exhausting a request to the BOP warden, to ask the sentencing court for a reduced sentence based on 'extraordinary and compelling reasons.' The U.S. Sentencing Commission defines categories of qualifying reasons in U.S. Sentencing Guidelines (USSG) § 1B1.13.

The specific question in *Rutherford* concerned whether non-retroactive changes in sentencing law — for example, the First Step Act's narrowing of certain stacked § 924(c) firearm penalties for offenses committed before December 21, 2018 — can themselves count as 'extraordinary and compelling reasons.' The Supreme Court held they cannot, at least standing alone, aligning with the majority of circuits that had already taken that view. According to coverage from LISA Newsletter (Legal Information Services Associates), SCOTUSblog, The Marshall Project, Forbes, and Davis Vanguard, the decision validates the restrictive approach most circuits had adopted while leaving room for sentence-disparity arguments to be raised at sentencing or on direct appeal.

For people already incarcerated, the practical effect varies by circuit. In circuits that had already barred non-retroactive sentencing changes as a basis for relief (including the Third, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth), *Rutherford* changes little. In circuits that had allowed such arguments (notably the Fourth, Ninth, and Tenth before recent shifts), the decision forecloses that pathway. Medical, family, age-related, and abuse-in-custody grounds enumerated in USSG § 1B1.13 remain available.

UNDERSTANDING THIS STORY

DURING INCARCERATION

If you have a pending or planned compassionate release motion

If your motion relies primarily on a non-retroactive change in sentencing law — most commonly, the FSA's amendments to 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) stacking, or to the safety-valve provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(f) — that argument alone will not now succeed in any circuit. If your motion combines a sentencing-law argument with one or more of the qualifying categories under USSG § 1B1.13 (serious medical condition, advanced age with deteriorating health, death or incapacitation of a caregiver for a minor child or spouse, victim of sexual or physical abuse in custody, or an 'other reasons' showing of comparable gravity), the qualifying ground should be the lead of any refiled motion.

Review your motion with counsel or, if pro se, with your unit team and institution law library staff. If your motion is pending, consider whether to file a supplement that re-frames the request around § 1B1.13's enumerated categories. If your motion has been denied without prejudice, refile with a strengthened medical or family showing may be appropriate.

Document everything that supports a § 1B1.13 ground: medical records from Health Services, BP-A0299 sick call forms, family caregiver affidavits, and any institutional records of abuse if applicable. The motion's strength now depends on the evidentiary record more than ever.

FAMILY, FRIENDS & ADVOCATES

How to support a compassionate release effort from outside

Family members can help build the evidentiary record that now matters most. If the motion is based on caregiver incapacitation, obtain physician letters, school enrollment documents for minor children, and signed statements from any current caregiver describing why their care cannot continue. If based on the prisoner's own medical condition, request outside medical opinions where possible, and keep dated copies of all BOP medical correspondence.

The required first step remains a written request to the warden under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). Either the prisoner files it directly or counsel files on their behalf. The court motion can be filed after 30 days from the warden's receipt of the request, or after the prisoner exhausts BOP administrative appeals from a denial. Mark the date of the warden request — the 30-day clock is jurisdictional in many courts.

If retaining counsel, ask specifically about the attorney's recent experience with § 1B1.13 medical and family-circumstance motions in the relevant district. Post-Rutherford practice will reward attorneys who build factual records, not those who relied primarily on sentencing-law arguments.

ATTORNEYS & PRISON OFFICIALS

Drafting and circuit-specific considerations after Rutherford

Rutherford does not disturb the U.S. Sentencing Commission's authority under 28 U.S.C. § 994(t) to define 'extraordinary and compelling reasons,' and the 2023 amendments to USSG § 1B1.13 — including the 'unusually long sentence' provision at § 1B1.13(b)(6) — remain in the Guideline text. Practitioners should expect circuit-level litigation over how § 1B1.13(b)(6) survives or is read against Rutherford, particularly in circuits where the provision was being applied permissively.

For motions still relying on a combination of grounds, lead with the strongest § 1B1.13(b)(1)-(b)(5) category and treat any sentencing-disparity argument as a § 3553(a) factor relevant to the discretionary second step, not as the 'extraordinary and compelling' showing itself. Document warden-request exhaustion meticulously: date stamps, delivery method, and any institutional response.

For the FY2026 compassionate release calendar, motions filed in summer and early fall typically see decisions before the September 30 fiscal year close, when BOP and U.S. Attorney's Office staffing patterns can affect response timelines.

POLICY & REGULATORY REFERENCES

The governing statute is 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A), which authorizes a court to reduce a sentence upon finding 'extraordinary and compelling reasons' and consideration of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors. The Sentencing Commission's policy statement at U.S. Sentencing Guidelines § 1B1.13 enumerates qualifying categories, including (b)(1) medical circumstances, (b)(2) age, (b)(3) family circumstances, (b)(4) victim of abuse in custody, (b)(5) other reasons of comparable gravity, and (b)(6) unusually long sentences where a change in law would produce a gross disparity. Rutherford addresses whether non-retroactive sentencing changes alone qualify, and concludes they do not. The Commission's rulemaking authority is grounded in 28 U.S.C. § 994(t).

The warden-exhaustion requirement is part of § 3582(c)(1)(A) itself: a defendant may file 30 days after the warden's receipt of a request or after fully exhausting BOP administrative remedies. BOP's internal

compassionate release procedures appear in Program Statement 5050.50 ('Compassionate Release/Reduction in Sentence: Procedures for Implementation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 3582 and 4205(g)'). The BOP administrative remedy process — applicable to appealing a warden denial — runs through 28 C.F.R. §§ 542.10–.19 (BP-8 informal, BP-9 to warden, BP-10 to regional director, BP-11 to general counsel).

For pre-2018 conduct involving stacked 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) firearm counts or pre-First Step Act safety-valve disqualifications under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(f), the legal change is non-retroactive by statute.

Rutherford means that disparity cannot, by itself, be the 'extraordinary and compelling reason.' It can still inform a court's § 3553(a) analysis if an independent qualifying reason is established.

ACTION ITEMS THIS WEEK

- If a compassionate release motion is pending and rests primarily on a non-retroactive sentencing change, contact counsel about supplementing the motion with a § 1B1.13(b)(1)–(b)(5) medical, age, family, or in-custody-abuse ground.
- Request a current medical records summary from Health Services using BP-A0299 (Inmate Request to Staff). Keep copies; the court motion will depend on this record.
- If filing a new warden request, send it via institution mail with a dated cop-out kept by the prisoner and a parallel copy mailed to counsel or family for time-stamp evidence of the 30-day clock.
- If the warden denies the request, file BP-9 within 20 calendar days of the denial; track BP-10 and BP-11 deadlines under 28 C.F.R. § 542.15. Exhaustion through BP-11 is one route to court access alongside the 30-day clock.
- Confirm circuit-specific case law with counsel before filing, because circuits will differ in how they apply Rutherford to USSG § 1B1.13(b)(6) 'unusually long sentence' motions.
- Calendar the motion for filing well before September 30, 2026 if a fiscal-year decision matters; later filings may push into the next fiscal year's docket cycle.

SOURCES

Compassionate Release Takes It on the Chin – Update for June 2, 2026 — *LISA Newsletter (Legal Information Services Associates)*

Compassionate Release Lessons from Rutherford – Update for June 8, 2026 — *LISA Newsletter (Legal Information Services Associates)*

How The Supreme Court Is Tightening Early Prison Release — *The Marshall Project*

Supreme Court Narrows Compassionate Release For Federal Prisoners — *Forbes*

Supreme Court limits what federal prisons count for compassionate release — *KUOW*

The Supreme Court's neutering of the First Step Act — *SCOTUSblog*

DEEP DIVE 2

BOP to Transfer Eligible Individuals to Minimum-Security Camps Ahead of Release

Theme: camp transfers / reentry

On May 28, 2026, the Bureau of Prisons announced a policy under which eligible individuals will be transferred to minimum-security federal prison camps after they have received a date for transfer to a Residential Reentry Center (RRC, commonly called a halfway house) or for placement on home confinement. A federal prison camp is the lowest custody level in the BOP system — open-perimeter facilities typically attached to a larger institution, housing individuals with low PATTERN risk scores and minimal disciplinary history. The BOP framing, reported by Correctional News and analyzed in the LISA Newsletter, treats the transfer as a step toward community reentry: a quieter, lower-stress setting in the final months of incarceration.

The policy interacts with several existing reentry pathways. Under the Second Chance Act (18 U.S.C. § 3624(c)) and First Step Act (FSA) provisions at 18 U.S.C. § 3624(g), eligible individuals may earn placement in RRCs or home confinement using Earned Time Credits (ETCs). The new camp-transfer step would precede RRC or home-confinement placement, not replace it.

For families, the practical effect is twofold. First, individuals currently held at low- or medium-security facilities awaiting RRC dates may now be redesignated to a camp first. Second, the geographic location of the receiving camp may differ from the prior institution, which has implications for visitation, mail forwarding, and the transition logistics that affect the final months before release.

UNDERSTANDING THIS STORY

DURING INCARCERATION

Determining eligibility and requesting consideration

Eligibility for camp placement turns on the same factors used for any minimum-security designation: PATTERN (Prisoner Assessment Tool Targeting Estimated Risk and Needs) score in the minimum range, a public safety factor (PSF) review under BOP Program Statement 5100.08 (Inmate Security Designation and Custody Classification), absence of a detainer, and remaining sentence within camp-appropriate parameters. The new policy adds the practical trigger of having a confirmed RRC or home-confinement date.

If you have an RRC or home-confinement date and are not currently at a camp, ask your unit team about consideration for camp transfer at your next program review. Use BP-A0148 (Inmate Request to Staff, the 'cop-out') to make the request in writing so a record exists. Ask the unit team to document the response in your central file.

If you do not yet have an RRC date, focus on the inputs that drive that date: completion of FSA-approved productive activities and Evidence-Based Recidivism Reduction (EBRR) programs to accumulate ETCs, maintenance of a clear disciplinary record, and accurate calculation of credits by your case manager. The camp-transfer step follows from those earlier inputs.

FAMILY, FRIENDS & ADVOCATES

What to expect logistically when a transfer happens

Camp transfers under this policy are designation moves, not furloughs. Expect a holdover period in transit through a federal transfer center or a stop at another institution before arrival at the receiving camp. During transit, telephone and email (TRULINCS) access is interrupted, and mail may be delayed by two to four weeks. Funds in the prisoner trust account transfer with the individual but may take days to become spendable at the new commissary.

Visitation must be re-approved at the receiving facility. The visitor list does not transfer automatically; visitors typically must re-submit a BP-A0629 Visitor Information form at the new institution. Plan for a gap of two to six weeks in approved-visitor status after a transfer.

For families planning summer visits, confirm the prisoner's current designation on the BOP inmate locator at bop.gov before traveling, and call the receiving institution's visiting office to confirm visit-day procedures. Camps generally have more flexible visiting hours and family-friendly layouts than higher-security facilities, but procedures still vary by institution.

BEFORE INCARCERATION

If you are pre-sentence or pre-self-surrender

For defendants who have not yet self-surrendered, the camp-transfer policy is downstream of designation. The decisions that matter most now are: pursuing a judicial recommendation in the judgment of conviction for a specific facility or facility type, ensuring the Presentence Investigation Report (PSR) is accurate on factors that drive PSFs (immigration status, sex-offense history, violence history, sentence length, escape history), and documenting any medical or mental-health needs that affect designation.

If your projected PATTERN risk would place you at a minimum-security camp from the start, the new policy is less directly relevant — you would be camp-housed throughout. If your projected designation is low or medium security, the policy means you may see a camp at the end of your sentence even if not at the beginning.

Discuss with counsel whether to ask the sentencing judge for a recommendation referencing reentry programming and proximity to a specific RRC catchment area. Judicial recommendations are not binding on the BOP under 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b) but are considered in designation.

POLICY & REGULATORY REFERENCES

Designation authority sits with the BOP under 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b), which directs the Bureau to consider the offense, the prisoner's history and characteristics, recommendations of the sentencing court, any pertinent policy statement issued by the Sentencing Commission, and the resources of the facility. BOP Program Statement 5100.08 implements that statute through the Inmate Security Designation and Custody Classification system, including the Custody Classification Form and PSF assignments.

The FSA's reentry pathway runs through 18 U.S.C. § 3632(d)(4) (Earned Time Credits) and 18 U.S.C. § 3624(g) (use of credits toward prerelease custody or supervised release). PATTERN, the risk assessment tool required by 18 U.S.C. § 3632(a), produces minimum, low, medium, or high risk scores. ETCs accrue at 10 or 15 days per 30 days of successful programming, depending on PATTERN score and assessment cycle.

The Second Chance Act, codified at 18 U.S.C. § 3624(c), permits up to 12 months of RRC placement and home confinement of up to the shorter of 10% of the sentence or 6 months at the end of the sentence. The CARES Act home-confinement authority used during the COVID-19 emergency expired; current home-confinement authority for most prisoners runs through § 3624(c) and the FSA. BOP Program Statement 7310.04 (Community Corrections Center Utilization and Transfer Procedure) governs RRC referrals; the Community Corrections Manager (CCM) for each region administers placements.

ACTION ITEMS THIS WEEK

- If you have an RRC date but are not at a camp, request consideration for camp transfer via BP-A0148 to your unit team and ask for the response to be documented at your next program review.
- Confirm your current PATTERN score with your case manager; ETC accrual and camp eligibility both turn on it.
- Verify FSA ETC calculations on your sentence computation. Discrepancies should first be raised informally with the case manager; if unresolved, file BP-8 (informal resolution) and then BP-9 (to the warden) under 28 C.F.R. § 542.13.
- If a family member is transferring to a camp, re-submit BP-A0629 visitor forms at the receiving institution rather than assume the prior list will carry over.
- For pre-sentence defendants, work with counsel on a § 3621(b) facility recommendation in the proposed judgment language, with a factual basis tied to family location or specific programming needs.
- Check the BOP inmate locator at bop.gov regularly during any expected transfer window; designation status may change before the prisoner can communicate it home.

SOURCES

Going Home? First, a Little Minicamp... – Update for June 11, 2026 — *LISA Newsletter (Legal Information Services Associates)*

BOP Expands Minimum-Security Camp Use for Reentry — *Correctional News*

DEEP DIVE 3

BOP Reports In-Custody Death at USP Terre Haute

Theme: deaths / custody / notification

The Bureau of Prisons released a press notification on June 2, 2026, reporting the death of an individual in custody at the United States Penitentiary at Terre Haute (USP Terre Haute), a high-security federal prison in

western Indiana. BOP press releases on in-custody deaths follow a standard template: facility, date, name, and a statement that the FBI and local authorities have been notified and that the matter is under review. They do not state cause of death pending autopsy and investigation.

For families of incarcerated individuals at USP Terre Haute and other high-security facilities, every such notification is also a prompt to confirm next-of-kin contact information on file with the institution. Under BOP policy, the warden is responsible for notifying the designated next of kin in the event of death or serious illness. Outdated contact information can delay that notification.

This section is included to help readers understand the notification process and the records they may seek if a death occurs.

UNDERSTANDING THIS STORY

FAMILY, FRIENDS & ADVOCATES

Confirming next-of-kin status and obtaining records

Each prisoner's central file contains a Form BP-A0408 designating next of kin and an emergency contact. The prisoner controls this designation. If you believe you are the next of kin but have not been contacted in past situations, ask the prisoner to verify the form with their case manager and update it if needed.

In the event of an in-custody death, the institution typically contacts the designated next of kin by telephone. The BOP issues a public press release on a separate timeline. Autopsy reports are produced by the local medical examiner or coroner, not the BOP, and are obtained from that office under state public-records law. The BOP After-Action Review and any Mortality Review Committee findings are internal BOP documents and can be sought through a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request under 5 U.S.C. § 552, directed to the BOP FOIA office.

FOIA requests should specify the prisoner's name and register number, the date of death, the records sought (e.g., 'mortality review,' 'after-action review,' 'medical records for the 90 days preceding death'), and a fee waiver request if applicable. Medical records of a deceased individual require either a court order or proof of next-of-kin status.

ATTORNEYS & PRISON OFFICIALS

Civil and investigative posture

Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) claims arising from in-custody deaths must begin with an administrative claim filed on Standard Form 95 within two years of accrual, under 28 U.S.C. § 2401(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 2675(a). The claim is filed with the BOP Regional Counsel for the region containing the institution; for USP Terre Haute, that is the North Central Regional Office. The agency has six months to respond before suit may be filed.

Bivens claims against individual federal officers for Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference theories face the limitations articulated in *Egbert v. Boule* and earlier Supreme Court decisions narrowing implied causes of action. Counsel evaluating a case should review the medical and disciplinary record, BOP Health Services records, any use-of-force documentation under BOP Program Statement 5566.06, and state medical-examiner findings.

The DOJ Office of the Inspector General accepts complaints regarding BOP staff misconduct and conducts independent reviews of certain in-custody deaths. The OIG hotline and reporting portal are publicly available.

DURING INCARCERATION

If you are housed at USP Terre Haute or another high-security facility

Confirm with your case manager that your BP-A0408 next-of-kin designation is current. Ask for a printed copy showing the current information. If your emergency contact has changed phone numbers, addresses, or relationships, submit a request to staff (BP-A0148) to update the form.

For medical concerns, document sick call requests in writing using BP-A0299. Keep your own copy when possible. A paper trail matters both for your present care and, in the event of any future review, for the record. Chronic-care designations and any specialist referrals should be reflected in the medical record; if they are not, raise the gap with Health Services and, if unresolved, through the administrative remedy process under 28 C.F.R. §§ 542.10–19.

POLICY & REGULATORY REFERENCES

BOP notification and death-review procedures are governed by BOP Program Statement 5553.06 (Escapes/Deaths Notification) and related health-services policy. Mortality reviews are conducted under BOP medical policy and are not routinely released publicly; they are obtainable through FOIA (5 U.S.C. § 552) with the limitations of Exemptions 6 and 7(C) for personal privacy.

FTCA exhaustion is governed by 28 U.S.C. § 2675(a), with the two-year administrative claim deadline at § 2401(b). The administrative claim is the Standard Form 95, filed with the regional BOP Regional Counsel. Suit is filed in federal district court after agency denial or after six months of inaction.

The DOJ OIG investigative authority is under the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.). OIG reports on BOP operations are published at oig.justice.gov. The Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-242) requires federal agencies to report in-custody deaths to the Attorney General, though enforcement and data publication have been the subject of recent OIG review.

ACTION ITEMS THIS WEEK

- Ask the incarcerated person to confirm BP-A0408 next-of-kin designation is current and to request a printed copy through their unit team.
- If a death occurs, request a copy of the autopsy report directly from the relevant county coroner or medical examiner, not from BOP.
- File a FOIA request for the BOP mortality review and after-action review, citing 5 U.S.C. § 552, addressed to the BOP FOIA office (320 First Street NW, Washington, DC 20534).
- For potential FTCA claims, calendar the two-year deadline from date of death and file Standard Form 95 with the BOP North Central Regional Counsel for USP Terre Haute matters, or the appropriate regional office for other facilities.
- If concerns predate a death — e.g., unaddressed medical complaints — preserve documentation by asking the prisoner to send copies home of all BP-A0299 sick-call forms and BP-9/BP-10 responses.
- Report concerns about staff conduct to the DOJ OIG at oig.justice.gov/hotline.

SOURCES

Death at USP Terre Haute — *Bureau of Prisons*

Systemic Issues Inside Out Is Watching

Patterns the publication is tracking this week from source material and court filings. Each entry includes factual description of the pattern and concrete guidance for readers affected by it.

OIG findings on First Step Act implementation shortfalls

PATTERN

A Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General report covered by Forbes describes BOP shortfalls in implementing the First Step Act, including in the timely calculation and application of Earned Time Credits (ETCs) and in providing access to Evidence-Based Recidivism Reduction (EBRR) programs and Productive Activities (PAs) at every institution. The pattern is consistent with disputes raised by prisoners and their counsel since the FSA took effect: credits not appearing on sentence computations, credits appearing then disappearing on reassessment, and waitlists for the programs that drive credit accrual.

In parallel, the Supreme Court has granted certiorari in a pro se case (covered by LISA Newsletter) addressing whether 28 U.S.C. § 2241 — the general federal habeas statute — is an available vehicle to challenge BOP application of FSA time credits when administrative remedies do not produce relief. The decision in that case will shape how prisoners can press credit disputes in federal court.

WHAT FAMILIES AND DEFENDANTS CAN DO

If FSA credits appear incorrect on a sentence computation, the first step is to ask the case manager for a written explanation of the calculation. If unresolved informally, file BP-8 (informal resolution) and escalate through BP-9 to the warden, BP-10 to the regional director, and BP-11 to the BOP general counsel under 28 C.F.R. §§ 542.13–15. Document program completion certificates and waitlist requests in writing — these establish that lack of credits is attributable to BOP, not the prisoner. After exhausting administrative remedies, a § 2241 habeas petition can be filed in the federal district court of confinement; the pending Supreme Court case may affect what that petition can argue. Counsel familiar with FSA litigation is helpful but not required for § 2241.

SOURCES

Watchdog Report Shows Bureau Of Prison Falling Short On First Step Act — *Forbes*

Supremes Add Rare Pro Se Habeas Petition to Fall Docket – Update for June 12, 2026 — *LISA Newsletter (Legal Information Services Associates)*

Sentencing & Courts

Supremes Add Rare Pro Se Habeas Petition to Fall Docket

LISA Newsletter (Legal Information Services Associates) · 2026-06-12

The Supreme Court has granted certiorari in a pro se prisoner's petition addressing the use of 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas to challenge BOP application of First Step Act Earned Time Credits. Section 2241 is the general federal habeas statute used to challenge the execution of a sentence, including credit calculations. The decision is expected during the October 2026 Term; until then, § 2241 practice in this area remains circuit-dependent.

Divided Supreme Court Nixes First Step Act Ruling

Law360 · 2026-06-08

Companion coverage of the Rutherford decision in trade press details the 5-4 split and the dissenting view that the majority's reading limits district court discretion in compassionate release motions. For practitioners, the takeaway is that § 1B1.13(b)(6) — the 'unusually long sentence' provision — will be the next litigation frontier in circuits where it had been used permissively.

Federal Judge Blocks Effort to Move 14 Transgender Women to Men's Prisons

lawdork.com · 2026-06-08

A federal court has issued an order halting the transfer of 14 transgender women from female-designated facilities to male-designated facilities while litigation proceeds. The order applies to the named plaintiffs and does not on its own change BOP designation policy generally. Individuals with concerns about gender-related designation should consult counsel familiar with the ongoing litigation; the National Center for Lesbian Rights and ACLU have been active in this area.

Second Amendment Challenge to § 922(g) Rejected (LISA coverage)

LISA Newsletter (Legal Information Services Associates) · 2026-06-09

Coverage of a recent decision rejecting a Second Amendment challenge to 18 U.S.C. § 922(g) firearm-possession charges in the context of a home search. The ruling continues the trend, post-Bruen, of circuit courts upholding § 922(g) convictions against constitutional challenges where the defendant has a qualifying prior. Defendants charged or convicted under § 922(g) should consult counsel about circuit-specific case law before relying on Bruen-based arguments.

BOP Operations

BOP Expands Minimum-Security Camp Use for Reentry

Correctional News · 2026-06-02

Trade-press coverage of the May 28 BOP policy expanding camp transfers for individuals with confirmed RRC or home-confinement dates. The policy is operational, not statutory; implementation will be visible in case-manager practice over the next several months. See the deep dive above for action steps.

Groups Urge Bureau of Prisons Not to Privatize Food Service

Center for Science in the Public Interest · 2026-06-08

Advocacy organizations have raised concerns about a proposal to privatize federal prison food service. Food service in BOP facilities is governed by BOP Program Statement 4700.06 (Food Service Manual). Any procurement change would proceed through federal contracting processes. For prisoners and families, the practical effect is not immediate; if a contract is awarded, menu, portion, and religious-diet (BP-A0264 Inmate Religious Diet Request) procedures could change at affected facilities.

DOJ Honors Fallen Correctional Officers

WVVA · 2026-06-11

Annual DOJ memorial recognizing correctional officers who died in the line of duty. The ceremony is informational for readers; institutional schedules may be lightly modified at affected facilities on memorial days.

Policy & Legislation

First Step Implementation Act

The Marshall Project · 2026-06-06

Coverage of the First Step Implementation Act, the pending legislation that would make portions of the 2018 First Step Act's sentencing-reduction provisions retroactive — particularly the changes to 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) stacking and to safety-valve eligibility. Following Rutherford, retroactivity for these provisions would require an act of Congress; the bill is the legislative vehicle to do so. The bill's status should be tracked through [Congress.gov](https://www.congress.gov).

Congressional Inquiry Into DOJ Prison-Policy Change

MS NOW · 2026-06-12

Members of Congress have requested information from the Department of Justice regarding a recent change in BOP policy and its application in a specific high-profile case. Congressional inquiries do not change policy directly but can produce documentary record useful for advocacy and oversight.

Some Odds and Ends – LISA Update for June 4, 2026

LISA Newsletter (Legal Information Services Associates) · 2026-06-04

LISA's weekly notes cover DOJ rights-restoration activity under 18 U.S.C. § 925(c) and related Second Amendment developments. For individuals with prior felony convictions seeking firearms-rights restoration, the procedural pathway has shifted in the past year; counsel should review current DOJ procedures before relying on prior practice.

Reentry & Halfway House

Former NFL Player Transferred From Prison to Halfway House

WDSU · 2026-06-09

Coverage of a high-profile RRC transfer. Such transfers are governed by BOP Program Statement 7310.04 and 18 U.S.C. § 3624(c); the timing typically falls within the last 12 months of the sentence. The public attention to particular cases does not change the underlying eligibility framework, which applies uniformly based on PATTERN score, sentence remaining, and program needs.

Ian Roberts Serving Federal Sentence in Illinois

KCCI · 2026-06-11

A widely covered defendant has been designated to a federal facility in Illinois. The story is included to illustrate how the BOP inmate locator at bop.gov serves as the public source for designation information — useful for families confirming a loved one's current placement.

PRACTICAL TIP

Summer visitation: Juneteenth and the observed July 4 holiday

Juneteenth (Friday, June 19) and Independence Day, observed Friday, July 3, both fall within this issue's window and both are federal holidays. On federal holidays, BOP institutions typically operate on a modified schedule. Visiting may be available, restricted, or cancelled depending on the facility; phone (TRULINCS) and email (CorrLinks) may run on a holiday schedule with longer queues; mail processing is delayed by the U.S. Postal Service holiday closure.

Before traveling to visit, call the institution's visiting office to confirm holiday-weekend hours. The institution's main number is listed on the facility's page at bop.gov; ask specifically about holiday visiting and any change to the visit-day procedure (identification requirements, arrival time, dress code). If you are flying or driving long distances for a Juneteenth or Fourth of July weekend visit, build in a buffer day in case the visit is rescheduled. For mail, anticipate 1–3 day delays around each holiday; time-sensitive legal correspondence should be sent priority or with tracking and ideally well before the holiday week.

Inside Out will return in two weeks with continued coverage of Rutherford's circuit-by-circuit application, BOP camp-transfer implementation, and the OIG's First Step Act findings. Readers who need further assistance navigating a specific federal-prison matter can reach DrPrison.org at help@drprison.org.

NEED FURTHER ASSISTANCE?

Readers navigating a specific federal-prison matter — a designation question, a halfway house issue, an administrative remedy, a compassionate release motion — can reach DrPrison.org directly at help@drprison.org. Inside Out is a free service; no subscription required.

Inside Out is published biweekly by DrPrison.org. Founded by Dr. Patrick Fisher, PhD, LPC, NCC. Editorial contributions from lived-experience consultants including Ken Gaughan.

This briefing is for informational purposes only and does not constitute legal advice. For legal questions consult a qualified federal criminal defense attorney. For crisis support in the United States, call or text 988.

<https://drprison.org/newsletter>