

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

No. 15-11078
Conference Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

August 16, 2016

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

DANTANA TANKSLEY,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:15-CR-38-1

Before REAVLEY, ELROD, and GRAVES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Appealing the judgment in a criminal case, Dantana Tanksley raises arguments that are foreclosed by *United States v. Alcantar*, 733 F.3d 143, 145-46 (5th Cir. 2013), *United States v. Rose*, 587 F.3d 695, 705 (5th Cir. 2009), and *United States v. Ford*, 509 F.3d 714, 716-17 (5th Cir. 2007). In *Alcantar*, we rejected the argument that *Nat'l Fed'n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius*, 132 S. Ct. 2566 (2012), affected our prior jurisprudence rejecting challenges to the

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 15-11078

constitutionality of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). 733 F.3d at 145-46. In *Rose*, we held that *Flores-Figueroa v. United States*, 556 U.S. 646 (2009), did not alter the proof required in a § 922(g)(1) case. 587 F.3d at 705. In *Ford*, we held that a Texas conviction for possession with intent to deliver is a “controlled substance offense.” 509 F.3d at 716-17.

Accordingly, the Government’s motion for summary affirmance is GRANTED, the alternative motion for an extension of time to file a brief is DENIED, and the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.