

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Unpublished order of the court of appeals

United States v. Finney, No. 25-4417, ECF Doc. 28 (4th Cir. March 12, 2026)..... 1a

Appendix B: Judgment of the court of appeals

United States v. Finney, No. 25-4417, ECF Doc. 29 (4th Cir. March 12, 2026)..... 3a

Appendix C: Order of the district court

United States v. Finney, No. 4:24-cr-86, ECF Doc. 16 (E.D. Va. March 10, 2025)..... 4a

FILED: March 12, 2026

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-4417
(4:24-cr-00086-JKW-DEM-1)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

AHMOD KESHAWN FINNEY,

Defendant - Appellant.

O R D E R

Ahmod Keshawn Finney pled guilty without a plea agreement to possession of a firearm and ammunition by a convicted felon, in violation of [18 U.S.C. §§ 922\(g\)\(1\), 924\(a\)\(8\)](#). The district court sentenced Finney to 28 months' imprisonment and 3 years' supervised release. Finney now appeals and argues that § 922(g)(1) is unconstitutional, both facially and as applied to him, following *New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n v. Bruen*, [597 U.S. 1](#) (2022). The Government moves for summary affirmance based on *United States v. Canada*, [123 F.4th 159, 161-62](#) (4th Cir. 2024), and *United States v. Hunt*, [123 F.4th 697, 700, 702-08](#) (4th Cir.

2024), *cert. denied*, [145 S.Ct. 2756](#) (2025), in which this court sustained the constitutionality of § 922(g)(1) against facial and as-applied challenges. The Government contends that Finney’s issues on appeal are “manifestly unsubstantial” after *Canada* and *Hunt*. See [4th Cir. R. 27\(f\)\(1\)](#). Although Finney concedes that *Canada* and *Hunt* defeat his arguments, he nevertheless opposes summary affirmance.

Because *Canada* and *Hunt* foreclose the arguments that Finney pursues on appeal, we conclude that summary affirmance is proper. We therefore grant the Government’s motion for summary affirmance.

Entered at the direction of the panel: Judge Wilkinson, Judge King, and Senior Judge Keenan.

For the Court

/s/ Nwamaka Anowi, Clerk

FILED: March 12, 2026

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-4417
(4:24-cr-00086-JKW-DEM-1)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

AHMOD KESHAWN FINNEY

Defendant - Appellant

J U D G M E N T

In accordance with the decision of this court, the judgment of the district court is affirmed.

This judgment shall take effect upon issuance of this court's mandate in accordance with [Fed. R. App. P. 41](#).

/s/ NWAMAKA ANOWI, CLERK

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA**

Newport News Division

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

AHMOD KESHAWN FINNEY,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:24-cr-86

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant Ahmod Finney’s Motion to Dismiss. ECF No. 14. The defendant moves to dismiss the one-count indictment against him, which alleges that the defendant possessed a firearm after having been convicted of a felony in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). ECF No. 14; ECF No. 1. The government filed a response in opposition to the motion on March 7, 2025. ECF No. 15.

The defendant argues that Section 922(g)(1) “violates the Second Amendment both facially and as applied to [the defendant].” ECF No. 14 at 1. But, as the defendant concedes in his motion, the defendant’s arguments are foreclosed by Fourth Circuit precedent. *See United States v. Canada*, 123 F.4th 159, 161 (4th Cir. 2024) (holding that 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) is not facially unconstitutional); *United States v. Hunt*, 123 F.4th 697, 702 (4th Cir. 2024) (holding that “neither *Bruen* nor *Rahimi* abrogates [Fourth Circuit] precedent foreclosing as-applied challenges to Section 922(g)(1) and those decisions thus remain binding”).

Accordingly, the defendant's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 14) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



/s/

Jamar K. Walker
United States District Judge

Newport News, Virginia
March 10, 2025