

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-7870

ALVIS DAMON WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

R. HUDGINS, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at
Wheeling. John Preston Bailey, District Judge. (5:20-cv-00119-JPB)

Submitted: July 17, 2023

Decided: August 2, 2023

Before WYNN and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Alvis Damon Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Maximillian Fitzsimmons Nogay, OFFICE OF
THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Wheeling, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Alvis Damon Williams, a federal prisoner, appeals the district court’s order adopting the magistrate judge’s recommendation and dismissing without prejudice Williams’ 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition in which he sought to challenge his 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) conviction under *Rehaif v. United States*, 139 S. Ct. 2191 (2019), by way of the savings clause in 28 U.S.C. § 2255(e). The Supreme Court has squarely held “that § 2255(e)’s savings clause does not permit a prisoner asserting an intervening change in statutory interpretation to circumvent [the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996]’s restrictions on second or successive § 2255 motions by filing a § 2241 petition.” *Jones v. Hendrix*, 143 S. Ct. 1857, 1864 (2023). Like the petitioner in *Jones*, Williams may not challenge his § 922(g)(1) conviction based on *Rehaif* through a § 2241 petition by way of § 2255(e)’s savings clause. *See id.* Accordingly, we deny Williams’ motion to remand and affirm the district court’s judgment. *Williams v. Hudgins*, No. 5:20-cv-00119-JPB (N.D.W. Va. Dec. 2, 2020). 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.

AFFIRMED