

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-3082**September Term, 2025****1:08-cr-00124-JMC-1****Filed On:** February 18, 2026

United States of America,

Appellee

v.

Wei Chin,

Appellant

**ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

BEFORE: Millett, Pan, and Garcia, Circuit Judges

J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the brief, the supplement thereto, the appendix, and the supplemental appendix filed by appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). Upon consideration of the foregoing, the motion for appointment of counsel; the motion to dismiss and the response thereto; the motion for certificate of appealability; and the motion for discovery, it is

ORDERED that the motion for appointment of counsel be denied. Appellant is not entitled to appointment of counsel under 18 U.S.C. § 3006A. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to dismiss be denied. Appellant appeals only the district court's July 10, 2025 minute order denying appellant leave to file a discovery motion. As to that order, the appeal is timely, see Fed. R. App. P. 4(b)(1)(A)(i), and no certificate of appealability is required, see 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for certificate of appealability be denied. Appellant does not need a certificate of appealability to appeal the July 10, 2025 minute order or to raise particular claims or arguments in this appeal. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1). It is

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-3082**September Term, 2025**

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's minute order entered July 10, 2025, be affirmed. Appellant has not shown that the district court abused its discretion by denying him leave to file a discovery motion in his closed case. See Banner Health v. Price, 867 F.3d 1323, 1334-35 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (noting that district court has discretion to determine how best to manage its docket); Berry v. District of Columbia, 833 F.2d 1031, 1037 n.24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) ("A trial court's decisions with respect to the management of its docket are normally entitled to deference."). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for discovery be dismissed as moot. Appellant has attached to the motion a complete copy of the judgment that he requests be produced. See United States v. Chin, 519 F. App'x 690 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (per curiam). Contrary to appellant's assertion, no dissenting opinion issued in connection with the judgment. See id.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam