

26-5022

ORIGINAL

No. 25-1846

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

KING MIGUEL EDDIE CRAYTON,

Petitioner,

v.

J. N. WILLIAMS, D.L. MOON, T.N. HAMNER

Respondents.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Fourth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

King Miguel Eddie Crayton

Pro Se Petitioner

5582-C Cardiff Court

Richmond, VA 23227

(804) 975-1796

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Whether a federal district court violates due process when it dismisses a pro se litigant's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint without meaningful consideration of the factual allegations and without affording a genuine opportunity to amend.

Whether a court of appeals may affirm dismissal of a pro se civil rights complaint on procedural grounds without addressing the underlying constitutional violations.

Whether dismissal practices that prevent substantive review of pro se civil rights claims undermine the constitutional guarantee of access to the courts.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner:

King Miguel Eddie Crayton (pro se)

Respondents:

J. N. Williams, Deputy

D. L. Moon, Deputy

T. N. Hamner, Deputy

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was entered on September 22, 2025. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner filed a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging constitutional violations by state actors.

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia granted Petitioner leave to proceed in forma pauperis but subsequently dismissed the complaint, concluding that it failed to meet pleading standards and that amendment would be futile.

Petitioner appealed. On September 22, 2025, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit affirmed the dismissal in an unpublished per curiam opinion. The court concluded that

FILED

OCT 27 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

the district court followed proper procedure but did not substantively address the constitutional violations alleged.

This petition seeks review of that judgment.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I. This Case Presents an Important Federal Question on the Treatment of Pro Se Civil Rights Claims

This case presents a recurring and important federal question: whether lower courts may dismiss pro se civil rights complaints without meaningfully addressing the underlying constitutional violations.

Petitioner brought claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging violations of federally protected rights. The lower courts resolved the case solely on procedural grounds, without substantive engagement with those constitutional claims. This approach raises serious concerns regarding the integrity of judicial review and the enforcement of constitutional protections.

II. The Decision Below Conflicts with This Court's Precedent Requiring Liberal Construction of Pro Se Pleadings

This Court has repeatedly emphasized that pro se pleadings must be liberally construed and that dismissal without leave to amend is disfavored unless amendment would clearly be futile. Here, the district court dismissed Petitioner's complaint without providing a meaningful opportunity to amend and without fully analyzing the factual allegations presented. The court's conclusion of futility was conclusory and deprived Petitioner of a fair opportunity to present his claims.

The Fourth Circuit's affirmance reinforces this departure from established principles and warrants this Court's review.

III. The Case Implicates the Fundamental Right of Access to the Courts

The Constitution guarantees meaningful access to the courts. When courts dismiss claims without addressing their substance, particularly in cases involving pro se litigants alleging constitutional violations, that guarantee is undermined.

This case reflects a broader systemic issue in which procedural barriers prevent substantive justice. Review by this Court is necessary to ensure that constitutional claims receive meaningful consideration.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

King Miguel Eddie Crayton

Pro Se Petitioner

APPENDIX

Appendix A

United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit Opinion (September 22, 2025)

Appendix B

United States District Court Final Order (July 2, 2025)

Appendix C

District Court Order (January 27, 2025)

Appendix D Court proceedings.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of this petition has been served on all parties by mail.

Date: _____

Signature: _____

King Miguel Eddie Crayton