

FILED
United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

June 2, 2025

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DEJUAN DION BRUNER,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 23-6122
(D.C. No. 5:22-CR-00518-SLP-1)
(W.D. Okla.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **MATHESON, BACHARACH**, and **PHILLIPS**, Circuit Judges.**

This matter is before us on the United States' *Motion to Lift Abatement and Unopposed Motion for Summary Affirmance*.

The United States moves for summary affirmance based on this court's recent published decision in *United States v. Jackson*, No. 23-6047, ___ F.4th ___, 2025 WL 1509987 (10th Cir. May 28, 2025). In *Jackson*, this court rejected Mr. Jackson's facial challenge that 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(9) violates the Second Amendment. Thus, the United States argues that *Jackson* forecloses Appellant Dejuan Dion Bruner's

* This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

** Because this matter is being decided on an unopposed motion for summary affirmance, the panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist in the determination of this appeal. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(f); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The case is therefore submitted without oral argument.

facial challenge to § 922(g)(9), the sole argument made by Mr. Bruner in this appeal.

Mr. Bruner does not object to the motion for summary affirmance.

Upon consideration, we lift the abatement of proceedings in this appeal which were abated pending a decision in *Jackson*, and we grant the United States' unopposed motion for summary affirmance.

The judgment of the district court is affirmed.

Entered for the Court

Per Curiam