

## **APPENDICES**

**APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A: Order of the Supreme Court  
of Mississippi Denying Post-Conviction Relief  
(September 12, 2025) ..... 1a

APPENDIX B: Order of the Supreme Court  
of Mississippi Setting Execution Date  
(September 12, 2025) ..... 5a

1a

APPENDIX A

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF MISSISSIPPI

No. 2024-DR-01386-SCT

CHARLES RAY CRAWFORD A/K/A CHUCK CRAWFORD  
A/K/A CHARLES CRAWFORD,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,  
*Respondent.*

Filed: September 12, 2025

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Petition for Post-Conviction Relief and the Motion for Oral Argument filed by Charles Ray Crawford. Also before the Court is the Motion to Dismiss filed by the State of Mississippi

The direct appeal of Crawford’s conviction and sentence of death was affirmed in ***Crawford v. State***, 716 So. 2d 1028 (Miss. 1998). Crawford’s first petition for post-conviction relief was denied in ***Crawford v. State***, 867 So. 2d 196 (Miss. 2003). His second petition for post-conviction relief was also denied. ***Crawford v. State***, 218 So. 3d 1142 (Miss. 2016).

Now before the Court is Crawford’s third petition for post-conviction relief. In response, the State maintains that each of Crawford’s claims is barred at this point and that the petition should be dismissed.

Leave to proceed should be granted only if Crawford’s petition, exhibits, and the prior record show that the claims are not barred and that they “present a substantial showing of the denial of a state or federal right[.]” Miss. Code Ann. § 99-39-27(5) (Rev. 2020); *see*

also **Ronk v. State**, 267 So. 3d 1239, 1247 (Miss. 2019). “Direct appeal [is] the principal means of reviewing all criminal convictions and sentences ....” Miss. Code Ann. § 99-39-3(2) (Rev. 2020). Review at this stage, with certain exceptions, is limited to issues that could not or should not have been reviewed at trial and in the direct appeal. Miss. Code Ann. § 99-39-3(2) (Rev. 2020); **Moffett v. State**, 351 So. 3d 936, 942 (Miss. 2022); **Brown v. State**, 798 So.2d 481, 491 (Miss. 2001).

The petitioner must overcome several procedural or substantive bars. First, the mandate in Crawford’s direct appeal issued in 1998. The petition now before the court was filed in December of 2024. This filing is subject to the one-year time bar. Miss. Code Ann. § 99-39-5(2)(b) (Rev. 2020); see also **Brown v. State**, 306 So. 3d 719, 729 (Miss. 2020); **Jordan v. State**, 213 So. 3d 40, 42 (Miss.2016); **Havard v. State**, 86 So. 3d 896, 899 (Miss. 2012). Unless Crawford shows that his claims are excepted, the petition is barred as untimely.

Second, as noted previously, Crawford has filed two prior petitions for post- conviction relief. The claims raised in each were denied. The current pleading is subject to the successive writ bar set out in Mississippi Code Section 99-39-27(9) (Rev.2020). Unless there is an applicable exception, a successive motion for post-conviction relief is procedurally barred. **Smith v. State**, 410 So.3d 1066, 1067 (Miss.2025). Unless Crawford meets an exception to the successive writ bar, his claims are precluded at this stage.

Crawford’s primary claim at this point is that the United States Supreme Court’s decision in **McCoy v. Louisiana**, 584 U.S. 414, 138 S. Ct. 1500, 200 L. Ed. 2d 821 (2018), amounts to an intervening decision and that he thus meets an exception to the bars. See Miss. Code Ann. § 99-39-5(2)(a)(i) (Rev.2020); Miss. Code

Ann. § 99-39-27(9) (Rev. 2020). We first note that Crawford waited seven years to file this claim after the decision in *McCoy* was issued. He makes no effort to argue why this claim could not have been brought sooner. See *Moffett v. State*, 351 So. 3d 936, 944 (Miss. 2022) (“Such delays should not be tolerated.”). We further find that Crawford has not shown that *McCoy* should be given retroactive effect. We conclude that no relief is warranted.

Crawford also presents several affidavits. These affidavits were executed more than a year before the petition was filed but were not presented to this Court until the State filed its motion to set an execution date. Further, Crawford has made no showing that the information in those affidavits could not have been presented at trial or in the initial petition. Again, this delay should not be condoned. After a full review of the affidavits and the related claims, the Court finds that Crawford has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a state or federal right and that no relief should be granted.

After a complete review of Crawford’s petition, we find that all of the claims now before the Court are barred and that the State’s motion to dismiss should be granted. Notwithstanding the bars, we find that the petition is without merit.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Motion to Dismiss filed by the State of Mississippi is granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Petition for Post-Conviction Relief filed by Charles Ray Crawford is dismissed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Motion for Oral Argument filed by Crawford is denied.

4a

SO ORDERED, this the 12th day of September,  
2025.

/s/ T. Kenneth Griffis, Jr. \_\_\_\_\_  
T. KENNETH GRIFFIS, JR.,  
JUSTICE

RANDOLPH, C.J., COLEMAN, P.J., MAXWELL,  
CHAMBERLIN, ISHEE, GRIFFIS, AND BRANNING,  
JJ., CONCUR.

KING, P.J., CONCURS IN RESULT ONLY.

SULLIVAN, J., NOT PARTICIPATING.

APPENDIX B  
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF MISSISSIPPI

No. 94-DP-01016-SCT

CHARLES RAY CRAWFORD,  
*Appellant,*

v.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,  
*Appellee.*

Filed: September 12, 2025

**EN BANC ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Motion to Set Execution Date and the Renewed Motion to Set Execution Date filed by the State of Mississippi, the Responses in Opposition to those motions filed by Charles Ray Crawford, the Reply filed by the State, and the Sur-Reply filed by Crawford. After due consideration, the Court finds Crawford. has exhausted all state and federal remedies for purposes of setting an execution date under Mississippi Code Section 99-19-106 (Rev. 2020). The Court therefore finds that the State's Renewed Motion to Set Execution Date should be granted and that a date should be set for execution of the death sentence imposed upon Crawford.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Renewed Motion to Set Execution Date filed by the State of Mississippi is hereby granted. The execution of the death sentence imposed upon Charles Ray Crawford shall take place in a manner provided by law on October 15, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. C.D.T., or as soon as possible thereafter within the next twenty-four (24) hours.

6a

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order shall serve as the warrant of execution for Charles Ray Crawford.

SO ORDERED, this the 12th day of September, 2025.

/s/ T. Kenneth Griffis, Jr. \_\_\_\_\_  
T. KENNETH GRIFFIS, JR.,  
JUSTICE

RANDOLPH, C.J., KING AND COLEMAN, P.JJ.,  
MAXWELL, CHAMBERLIN, ISHEE, GRIFFIS, AND  
BRANNING, JJ., CONCUR.

SULLIVAN, J., NOT PARTICIPATING.