

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

In the  
United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eleventh Circuit

---

No. 25-10494

Non-Argument Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

*versus*

ADAN E. SMITH,

a.k.a. Adan Smith,

*Defendant-Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of Florida  
D.C. Docket No. 8:24-cr-00305-TPB-SPF-1

---

Before NEWSOM, LUCK, and LAGOA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Adan Smith challenges his conviction for possessing a firearm as a convicted felon, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). He

asserts that § 922(g)(1) violates the Commerce Clause, both facially and as applied to him. But as Smith concedes, our precedent forecloses his argument. The statute is facially constitutional because it contains an express jurisdictional requirement. *United States v. Edwards*, 142 F.4th 1270, 1285 (11th Cir. 2025). And it's constitutional as applied to Smith because his firearms and ammunition traveled in interstate or foreign commerce at some point, which establishes the requisite "minimal nexus" between interstate commerce and his possession. *See id.*

**AFFIRMED.**