

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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 fire-arm 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.