United States Court of Appeals

For the	pe Eighth Circuit
N	No. 18-1286
Rodney	Lamont Sanders
	Plaintiff - Appellant
	V.
United	States of America
	Defendant - Appellee
	nited States District Court crict of Arkansas - Little Rock
Filed:	: December 26, 2018 January 8, 2019 Jnpublished]
Before BENTON, SHEPHERD, and	STRAS, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM.	
	istrict court's¹ denial of his 18 U.S.C. § 983(e) of property. He argues that he did not receive

¹The Honorable Brian S. Miller, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

notice of the forfeiture proceeding and that the government failed to take "reasonable steps" to ensure he received notice. *Id.* § 983(e)(1)(A). We review the court's factual findings for clear error and its legal conclusions de novo. *See United States v. Crumble*, 878 F.3d 656, 659 (8th Cir. 2018); *United States v. Quintero*, 648 F.3d 660, 665 (8th Cir. 2011).

Having carefully reviewed the record and the parties' arguments on appeal, we conclude that the government took "reasonable steps" to notify Sanders of the forfeiture proceeding, even if the notice did not reach him. 18 U.S.C. § 983(e)(1)(A); cf. Dusenbery v. United States, 534 U.S. 161, 168–73 (2002) (describing the due-process requirements for notice of a forfeiture proceeding and stating that actual notice is not required). Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.
