

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 20-11122
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

June 22, 2021

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

NGOC HONG NGUYEN,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:08-CR-119-18

Before JOLLY, ELROD, and GRAVES, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Ngoc Hong Nguyen was sentenced to eight months of imprisonment and 26 months of supervised release after he pleaded true to violating the terms of his supervised release. On appeal, he challenges the constitutionality of 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g), which mandates revocation of

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 20-11122

supervised release and a term of imprisonment for any offender who violates certain conditions of supervised release, including possessing a controlled substance or refusing to comply with the drug-testing requirement.

Relying on *United States v. Haymond*, 139 S. Ct. 2369 (2019), Nguyen contends 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. He concedes that his challenge is foreclosed under *United States v. Garner*, 969 F.3d 550 (5th Cir. 2020), *as revised* (Aug. 14, 2020), *cert. denied*, 141 S. Ct. 1439 (2021), and raises the issue to preserve it for further review. The Government has filed an unopposed motion for summary affirmance and, alternatively, for an extension of time to file its brief.

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