

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 25-11068  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

April 13, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

MAURICE COLEMAN,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:18-CR-59-1

---

Before DAVIS, JONES, and HO, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Maurice Coleman appeals from the judgment of the district court revoking his term of supervised release and sentencing him to 18 months of imprisonment. For the first time on appeal, Coleman contests the constitutionality of 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g), which mandates revocation of supervised release and imposition of a term of imprisonment for any offender

---

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

No. 25-11068

who violates particular conditions of supervised release, including, inter alia, possession of a firearm.

Relying on *United States v. Haymond*, 588 U.S. 634 (2019), Coleman maintains that § 3583(g) is unconstitutional because it requires revocation of a term of supervised release and imposition of a term of imprisonment without affording the defendant the constitutionally guaranteed right to a jury trial or requiring proof beyond a reasonable doubt. However, he acknowledges that his challenge is foreclosed by *United States v. Garner*, 969 F.3d 550 (5th Cir. 2020), and asserts the issue to preserve it for further review. The Government has filed an unopposed motion for summary affirmance or, in the alternative, for an extension of time to file its brief.

In *Garner*, we rejected the argument that Coleman has asserted and held that § 3583(g) is not unconstitutional under *Haymond*. See *Garner*, 969 F.3d at 551-53. Thus, Coleman's sole argument on appeal is foreclosed, and summary affirmance is proper. See *Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969). Accordingly, the Government's motion for summary affirmance is GRANTED, its alternative motion for an extension of time to file a brief is DENIED, and the district court's judgment is AFFIRMED.