

NO. \_\_\_\_\_

---

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

---

**OCTOBER TERM 2025**

---

**QUIONTE CRAWFORD, Petitioner,**

**v.**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Respondent**

---

**APPENDIX A  
ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

L. RICHARD WALKER  
First Assistant  
Federal Public Defender's Office  
For the Northern District of WV  
101 Cambridge Place  
Bridgeport, West Virginia 26330  
(304) 622-3823  
*Counsel for Quionte Crawford*

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 24-6926**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

QUIONTE CRAWFORD, a/k/a Kayla Stevens, a/k/a Quionte Jordan Crawford,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Clarksburg. Thomas S. Kleeh, Chief District Judge. (1:19-cr-00035-TSK-MJA-1; 1:21-cv-00114-TSK)

---

Submitted: July 8, 2025

Decided: December 2, 2025

---

Before NIEMEYER, RUSHING, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Linn Richard Walker, Assistant Federal Public Defender, OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, Clarksburg, West Virginia, for Appellant. David J. Perri, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Wheeling, West Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Quionte Crawford seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Crawford's 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists could find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. *See Buck v. Davis*, 580 U.S. 100, 115-17 (2017).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Crawford has not made the requisite showing. We further discern no abuse of discretion in the district court's decision not to hold an evidentiary hearing on Crawford's claims. *See United States v. Morris*, 917 F.3d 818, 826 (4th Cir. 2019) (noting standard of review); *see also United States v. McNeil*, 126 F.4th 935, 946 (4th Cir. 2025) (explaining "that a district court generally should dismiss, without an evidentiary hearing, a § 2255 [motion] that necessarily relies on allegations that contradict . . . sworn statements" movant made during a Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 hearing (citation modified)).

Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

*DISMISSED*