United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 24-40173

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

September 5, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

United States of America,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

Jamyia Roclaun Stanfield,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. 5:23-CR-706-1

Before Higginson, Willett, and Engelhardt, *Circuit Judges*. Per Curiam:*

Jamyia Roclaun Stanfield was convicted of being a felon in possession of a firearm in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). His prior felony convictions include (1) unlawful possession of a controlled substance; (2) unlawful delivery of a controlled substance; (3) unlawful possession of a firearm by a felon; and (4) possession of a controlled substance with the intent to deliver.

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 24-40173

Stanfield raises four challenges to § 922(g)(1) on appeal. As Stanfield concedes, all of his arguments are foreclosed by our precedent.

First, Stanfield's facial Second Amendment challenge to § 922(g)(1) is foreclosed by *United States v. Diaz*, 116 F.4th 458, 471–72 (5th Cir. 2024), cert. denied, No. 24-6625, ____ S. Ct. ____, 2025 WL 1727419 (U.S. June 23, 2025) (mem.).

Second, Stanfield's as-applied Second Amendment challenge to § 922(g)(1) is foreclosed by *United States v. Kimble*, 142 F.4th 308, 317–18 (5th Cir. 2025). Under *Kimble*, "[Stanfield's] conviction accords with the Second Amendment because Congress can categorically disarm individuals convicted of violent felonies like drug trafficking. That conclusion does not depend on an individualized assessment that [Stanfield] is dangerous." *Id.* at 318.

Third, Stanfield's "equal protection" challenge to § 922(g)(1) under the Fifth Amendment is foreclosed by *United States v. Goody*, 143 F.4th 617, 619 (5th Cir. 2025) (per curiam).

And finally, Stanfield's Commerce Clause challenge to § 922(g)(1) is foreclosed by *United States v. De Leon*, 170 F.3d 494, 499 (5th Cir. 1999), and *United States v. Alcantar*, 733 F.3d 143, 145–46 (5th Cir. 2013).

AFFIRMED.