

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-10655
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED
December 5, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL SEVIER,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:17-CR-69-1

Before RICHMAN, SOUTHWICK, and WILLETT, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Christopher Michael Sevier appeals from the judgment of the district court revoking his terms of supervised release and sentencing him to concurrent terms of 12 months and one day of imprisonment. For the first time on appeal, Sevier contests the constitutionality of 18 U.S.C. § 3583(g), which mandates revocation of supervised release and imposition of a term of

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 25-10655

imprisonment for any offender who violates particular conditions of supervised release, including, inter alia, refusal to comply with drug testing.

Relying on *United States v. Haymond*, 588 U.S. 634 (2019), Sevier maintains 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 or requiring proof beyond a reasonable doubt. However, he acknowledges that his challenge is foreclosed by *United States v. Garner*, 969 F.3d 550 (5th Cir. 2020), and asserts the issue to preserve it for further review. The Government has filed an unopposed motion for summary affirmance or, in the alternative, for an extension of time to file its brief.

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