

ADDENDUM

Appendix A

Digitized by Google

波音 747-100,150架

1. *Leucosia* (Leucosia) *leucosia* (L.) (Fig. 1)

THE CHARTER OF UNCONDITIONAL DISINTEGRATION

Yield Impact of Reuse

United States v. Silberman, 501 U.S. 469 (S.Ct. 1991) (S.Ct. held that § 1985(a) does not prohibit a state from enacting a statute that makes it a crime to discriminate on the basis of race, ethnicity, or national origin in the sale of real property).

visit www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu for more information.

Wheeler, 301 N. U.S. 101, D.W. TExAS 5819 (E.D. Mo. 1944).

Address: 12345 SW 141st Street, Miami, FL 33175 | Tel: (305) 555-1234 | Email: info@realestate.com

2210

to most difficult to boronate has, perhaps, an even more difficult boronate to make, and that is the boronate of boron. It is not possible to make boronate of boron, and that is the reason why boron is not used in boron neutron capture therapy.

61210807

United States of America, Plaintiff - Appellee v. Kenneth Robert Simpson, Defendant - Appellant
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT
653 Fed. Appx. 850; 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 9779
No. 16-1031
May 25, 2016, Submitted
May 31, 2016, Filed

Notice:

**PLEASE REFER TO FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE RULE 32.1 GOVERNING
THE CITATION TO UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS.**

Editorial Information: Subsequent History

Rehearing denied by United States v. Simpson, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 13996 (8th Cir. Mo., Aug. 1, 2016) US Supreme Court certiorari denied by Simpson v. United States, 137 S. Ct. 318, 196 L. Ed. 2d 232, 2016 U.S. LEXIS 6177 (U.S., Oct. 11, 2016) Related proceeding at, Decision reached on appeal by United States v. Simpson, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 24413 (8th Cir. Mo., Dec. 4, 2017)

Editorial Information: Prior History

Appeal from United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri - St. Louis. Simpson v. United States, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25616 (E.D. Mo., Feb. 28, 2014)

Counsel For United States of America, Plaintiff - Appellee: Allison Hart Behrens, Assistant U.S. Attorney, Robert F. Livergood, Assistant U.S. Attorney, U.S. Attorney's Office, Eastern District of Missouri, Saint Louis, MO.
Kenneth Robert Simpson, Defendant - Appellant, Pro se, Springfield, MO.

Judges: Before SMITH, ARNOLD, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

Opinion

{653 Fed. Appx. 850} PER CURIAM.

At a supervised release revocation hearing, Kenneth Simpson admitted that immediately upon commencement of his lifetime term of supervision, he had refused to {653 Fed. Appx. 851} follow his probation officer's instruction to register as a sex offender. He directly appeals after the district court1 revoked supervision, sentenced him to 12 months in prison, and reimposed a lifetime term of supervision.

Upon careful review of the record and the parties' briefs, we conclude that Simpson's arguments for reversal lack merit. First, we reject his argument that the district court abused its discretion by failing to recuse itself. See United States v. Martin, 757 F.3d 776, 778 (8th Cir. 2014) (standard of review). Second, Simpson's challenges regarding jurisdiction and double jeopardy amount to improperly raised collateral attacks on his underlying conviction and sentence. See United States v. Miller, 557 F.3d 910, 913 (8th Cir. 2009). Third, the record supports the district court's finding that Simpson violated his supervised release. See United States v. Black Bear, 542 F.3d 249, 252 (8th Cir. 2008) (standard of review). Fourth, the court did not err in reimposing a lifetime term of supervision, see 18

CHILDREN OF ALLEGORY

3. 24.32137

Finally, to obtain a more detailed description of the W_{WKB} boundary, we can use the

2000-0000

U.S.C. §§ 3583(h), (k); United States v. Asalati, 615 F.3d 1001, 1006 (8th Cir. 2010) (reasonableness of revocation sentence reviewed for abuse of discretion), and we reject his challenge to the reimposition of special release conditions, see United States v. Koch, 625 F.3d 470, 481 (8th Cir. 2010). Finally, Simpson's newly raised constitutional challenge to the Sex Offender Registration Act is not properly before us. See Liberty State Bank v. Minnesota Life & Health Ins. Guar. Ass'n, 149 F.3d 832, 834 (8th Cir. 1998).

Accordingly, we affirm.

Footnotes

1

The Honorable Rodney W. Sippel, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

A08CASES

2

© 2018 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group. All rights reserved. Use of this product is subject to the restrictions and terms and conditions of the Matthew Bender Master Agreement.

09849010

United States of America, Plaintiff - Appellee v. Kenneth Robert Simpson, Defendant - Appellant
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT
704 Fed. Appx. 609; 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 24413
No. 16-4498
November 6, 2017, Submitted
December 4, 2017, Filed

Notice:

**PLEASE REFER TO FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE RULE 32.1 GOVERNING
THE CITATION TO UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS.**

Editorial Information: Subsequent History

Rehearing denied by, Rehearing, en banc, denied by United States v. Simpson, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 1090 (8th Cir., Jan. 17, 2018)

Editorial Information: Prior History

Appeal from United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri - St. Louis. United States v. Simpson, 653 Fed. Appx. 850, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 9779 (8th Cir. Mo., May 31, 2016)

Counsel For United States of America, Plaintiff - Appellee: Allison Hart Behrens, Assistant U.S. Attorney, Robert F. Livergood, Assistant U.S. Attorney, U.S. Attorney's Office, Eastern District of Missouri, Saint Louis, MO.

Kenneth Robert Simpson, Defendant - Appellant, Pro se, Springfield, MO.

Judges: Before COLLTON, BOWMAN, and KELLY, Circuit Judges.

Opinion

{704 Fed. Appx. 609} PER CURIAM.

Kenneth Robert Simpson, proceeding pro se, appeals after the District Court1 revoked his supervised release for the second time, sentenced him to 18 months in prison, and reimposed a life term of supervised release.

After reviewing the record, we conclude that Simpson's jurisdictional and double-jeopardy arguments amount to collateral attacks on his conviction and sentence, see United States v. Miller, 557 F.3d 910, 913 (8th Cir. 2009) ("A defendant may challenge the validity of his underlying conviction and sentence through a direct appeal or a habeas corpus proceeding, not through a collateral attack in a supervised-release revocation proceeding."), and that his remaining arguments lack merit. Simpson also moves to strike a brief filed by his former counsel. Because Simpson is proceeding pro se, we have not considered the arguments raised in the counseled brief, and we deny as moot the motion to strike.

We affirm the judgment.

Footnotes

1

The Honorable Rodney W. Sippel, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

A08CASES

2

© 2018 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group. All rights reserved. Use of this product is subject to the restrictions and terms and conditions of the Matthew Bender Master Agreement.

09849010