

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6865

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

AYODELE HARRISON ARASOKUN,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 25-6968

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

AYODELE HARRISON ARASOKUN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia,
at Martinsburg. Gina M. Groh, District Judge. (3:17-cr-00086-GMG-RWT-1)

Submitted: May 28, 2026

Decided: June 2, 2026

Before WYNN, QUATTLEBAUM, and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ayodele Harrison Arasokun, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Ayodele Harrison Arasokun appeals the district court's orders denying his two Fed. R. Crim. P. 33 motions for a new trial. To succeed on a Rule 33 motion, a defendant must establish all of the following: "that (1) the evidence is newly discovered; (2) the defendant exercised due diligence; (3) the newly discovered evidence is not merely cumulative or impeaching; (4) the evidence is material; and (5) the evidence would probably result in acquittal at a new trial." *United States v. Ali*, 991 F.3d 561, 571 (4th Cir. 2021) (citation modified).

Upon review of the record, we discern no abuse of discretion in the district court's denials of Arasokun's motions. *See id.* at 570 (stating standard of review). Accordingly, we deny Arasokun's motion for judicial notice, and we affirm the district court's orders. *United States v. Arasokun*, No. 3:17-cr-00086-GMG-RWT-1 (N.D. W. Va. Oct. 1, 2025; Oct. 28, 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.

AFFIRMED