

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 21-2728

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Adam Lamons

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Western District of Missouri - Springfield

Submitted: January 18, 2022

Filed: May 2, 2022

[Unpublished]

Before COLLOTON, BENTON, and STRAS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Adam Lamons appeals the district court's¹ order revoking a grant of conditional release. Having jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, this court affirms.

¹The Honorable M. Douglas Harpool, United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri, adopting the report and recommendation of the Honorable David P. Rush, United States Magistrate Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

Lamons was first civilly committed under 18 U.S.C. § 4246 in 2017. In 2018, the district court granted him conditional release under section 4246(e)(2), and imposed conditions, including that he comply with a mental health regimen, not possess any deadly weapons, not communicate any threats, and refrain from committing any new crimes. In October 2020, the government filed several notices of violation and a motion for revocation of conditional release under section 4246(f), alleging that Lamons had violated his conditions of release by, among other things, failing to take his prescribed medication, brandishing scissors and threatening to kill a liquor store employee, attempting to stab a police officer with the scissors, and being charged with a crime.

Lamons's statutory and constitutional arguments relating to the denial of his request to obtain an independent mental examination prior to the revocation of his conditional release are foreclosed by this court's precedent. *See United States v. Spann*, 984 F.3d 711 (8th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 141 S. Ct. 2655 (2021); *see also United States v. O'Laughlin*, 934 F.3d 840, 841 (8th Cir. 2019) (de novo review). The evidence developed during the revocation proceeding supports the district court's determination that revocation was warranted. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 4246(f); *United States v. Franklin*, 435 F.3d 885, 889-90 (8th Cir. 2006).

The judgment is affirmed. Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted.
