

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 20-12191

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

GUY ST. AMOUR,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida
D.C. Docket No. 0:17-cr-60001-JIC-1

Before WILSON, LUCK, and LAGOA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Guy St. Amour was convicted for operating an aircraft with an unapproved fuel system, in violation of 49 U.S.C. section 46306(b)(9). *United States v. St. Amour*, 886 F.3d 1009, 1010 (11th Cir. 2018). After we affirmed the conviction on appeal, *id.* at 1016, St. Amour moved for a new trial and petitioned for a writ of error coram nobis. He claimed that there was newly discovered evidence showing that he didn't "operate" the aircraft under section 46306(b)(9), the government withheld *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963) evidence, and his trial counsel was ineffective for failing to hire an aviation expert. The district court denied the new trial motion and coram nobis petition because the evidence was not newly discovered and it would not have produced a different result in the case, the evidence was not favorable to St. Amour's defense, and St. Amour had not met the stringent requirements for extraordinary coram nobis relief.

After a thorough review of the record and with the benefit of oral argument, we affirm the district court's order denying St. Amour's new trial motion and coram nobis petition. We also deny St. Amour's request to withdraw the mandate in his earlier appeal. *See Calderon v. Thompson*, 523 U.S. 538, 549–50 (1998); 11th Cir. R. 41-1.

AFFIRMED.