

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6598

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD, a/k/a Johah Gabriel, a/k/a Jahjah T. Tishbite,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL; STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; S.C.D.C. GENERAL COUNSEL, With all of its members; BRYAN STIRLING, S.C.D.C. Director; S.C.D.C. DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL; WARDEN JAMES; A.W. SMITH; A.W. MCDUFFY; MAJOR MEEKS; SGT. CROWLEY; NURSE MILLER; WARDEN STONEBREAKER; UNITED STATES CONGRESS, And all members contained therein; CATHOLIC ARCH DIOCESE AND POPE; MR. LAWRENZ, Director of the Well Path Center; WELL PATH CENTER; 194 MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS; COUNTY OF RICHLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA; COUNTY OF KERSHAW; COUNTY OF HORRY; ADAIR FORD BOROUGHS, Federal Attorney for the State of South Carolina, U.S. Attorney; UNITED STATES SENATE, And all members contained therein,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort.
Bruce H. Hendricks, District Judge. (9:24-cv-04660-BHH-MHC)

Submitted: May 28, 2026

Decided: June 1, 2026

Before WYNN, QUATTLEBAUM, and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lawrence Crawford, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lawrence Crawford seeks to appeal the district court's orders (1) separating his complaint from three co-plaintiffs and (2) denying his motions for a preliminary injunction, appointment of counsel, recusal of the district court judge, recusal of the magistrate judge, appointment of a new magistrate judge, an extension of time, permission to intervene, consolidation of cases, complex case designation, reconsideration of the order separating his action from those of his co-plaintiffs, and various other forms of relief. * This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292, Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The orders Crawford seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders, with the exception of that portion of the district court's order denying injunctive relief. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal, in part, for lack of jurisdiction.

We do, however, have jurisdiction to review the portion of the order denying Crawford's request for preliminary injunctive relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). We review the denial of a preliminary injunction for an abuse of discretion. *Roe v. Dep't of Def.*, 947 F.3d 207, 219 (4th Cir. 2020). In evaluating the district court's decision, "we

* Crawford has also filed in this court motions to remand; to consolidate this appeal with docket numbers 25-6598, 25-6599, 25-6602; to vacate; for acceptance; for judicial notice; for a preliminary injunction; for a temporary restraining order; for sanctions; for a declaratory judgment; to submit additional evidence; and to supplement his motions. We grant Crawford's motion to accept his corrected, signed notice of appeal and deny all remaining motions.

review factual findings for clear error and assess legal conclusions de novo.” *Fusaro v. Cogan*, 930 F.3d 241, 248 (4th Cir. 2019). In order to receive a preliminary injunction, a plaintiff “must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” *Roe*, 947 F.3d at 219 (internal quotation marks omitted). A preliminary injunction is “an extraordinary remedy that may only be awarded upon a clear showing that the plaintiff is entitled to such relief.” *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 22 (2008).

Upon review of the record in conjunction with these authorities, we discern no abuse of discretion in the district court’s denial of preliminary injunctive relief. We therefore affirm the appealed-from order to the extent that it denied preliminary injunctive relief. *Crawford v. S.C. Att’y Gen.*, No. 9:24-cv-04660-BHH-MHC (D.S.C. July 22, 2025). 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 IN PART,
AFFIRMED IN PART*