

# APPENDIX

## TABLE OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Order by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Denying Successive Application (Jan. 13, 2026) .....	1a
Appendix B: Order by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Denying Successive Application (Oct. 30, 2025) .....	3a
Appendix C: Transcript Excerpt from February 21, 2012 Pretrial Hearing (Government Concession Regarding 21 U.S.C. § 959(b)).....	5a

**APPENDIX A**

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

January 13, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 25-20556  
\_\_\_\_\_

IN RE ADE LAWRENCE,

*Movant.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Motion for an Order Authorizing  
the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
to Consider a Successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 Motion  
\_\_\_\_\_

UNPUBLISHED ORDER

Before STEWART, WILLETT, and WILSON, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:

Ade Lawrence, former federal prisoner # 71658-279, petitions this court for authorization to file a second or successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion in the district court. In his motion, Lawrence renews his argument from his prior motion for authorization and relies on the same pretrial transcript to challenge the validity of the Government's theory of the case and to argue that trial counsel was ineffective.

To obtain authorization, Lawrence must make a prima facie showing that his claim relies on either "newly discovered evidence that, if proven and viewed in light of the evidence as a whole, would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that no reasonable factfinder would have found the movant guilty of the offense" or "a new rule of constitutional law,

made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable.” 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(C); *United States v. Hanner*, 32 F.4th 430, 434 (5th Cir. 2022).

Though Lawrence raises new arguments and provides more context for his claim, he relies on the same pretrial transcript on which he relied to support his previous motion for authorization. And he has not made a prima facie showing that, in light of the pretrial transcript, no reasonable factfinder would have found him guilty of conspiracy to violate 21 U.S.C. § 959(b). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h)(1).

Because Lawrence fails to make the requisite showing pursuant to § 2255(h), IT IS ORDERED that his motion for authorization to file a second or successive § 2255 motion is DENIED. His motion for the appointment of counsel is likewise DENIED.

Lawrence is WARNED that the submission of repetitive or frivolous filings will invite the imposition of sanctions, which may include dismissal, monetary sanctions, and restrictions on his ability to file pleadings in this court and any court subject to our jurisdiction. *See Coghlan v. Starkey*, 852 F.2d 806, 817 & n.21 (5th Cir. 1988).

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**