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Before Jones, Haynes, and Oldham, Circuit Judges.
Per Curiam:*
Christian Lamar Porter pleaded guilty to one count of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1) and 924(a)(2). Relying on National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius, 567 U.S. 519 (2012), he argues for the first time on appeal that § $922(\mathrm{~g})(1)$ exceeds the scope of Congress's power under the Commerce Clause and is

[^0]thus unconstitutional. The Government has filed an unopposed motion for summary affirmance and an alternative request for an extension of time to file its brief.

Porter correctly concedes that his arguments challenging the constitutionality of § $922(\mathrm{~g})(1)$ are foreclosed. See United States v. Alcantar, 733 F.3d 143, 145-46 (5th Cir. 2013); United States v. Daugherty, 264 F.3d 513, 518 (5th Cir. 2001); United States v. De Leon, 170 F.3d 494, 499 (5th Cir. 1999). He raises the arguments to preserve them for further review.

Because summary disposition is appropriate, see Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969), the Government's motion for summary affirmance is GRANTED, the alternative motion for an extension of time to file a brief is DENIED, and the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.


[^0]:    *This opinion is not designated for publication. See 5TH Cir. R. 47.5.

