

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, SHREVEPORT DIVISION

Robert Jackson, III v. Merrick B. Garland, et al.

Jackson v. Garland · No. 5:24-cv-01717 · Decided March 31, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana granted the United States’ Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss Robert Jackson III’s challenge to the federal firearm-possession restriction in 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). The court held that Louisiana’s continuing restrictions on concealed firearm possession meant Jackson’s civil rights had not been fully restored under 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20), and that application of § 922(g)(1) was constitutional as applied to his violent felony convictions. The court also rejected Jackson’s Commerce Clause argument concerning an allegedly intrastate firearm.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Shreveport Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	S. Maurice Hicks, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Shreveport Division
DECIDED	March 31, 2026
DOCKET	5:24-cv-01717
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought an action for declaratory and injunctive relief challenging the application and constitutionality of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g) (1), Louisiana firearm restrictions, and federal regulation of an allegedly intrastate firearm. The United States moved to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true, disregards legal conclusions, and determines whether the complaint states a facially plausible claim for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

PARTIES

Robert Jackson, III v. United States of America, Merrick B. Garland, et al.

TOPICS

motions to dismiss second amendment commerce clause statutory interpretation civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure constitutional law firearms law civil rights federal jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Louisiana law fully restored Jackson's civil rights for purposes of the firearm-rights exception in 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20), despite continuing restrictions on his ability to carry a concealed firearm.
2. Whether applying 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) to Jackson violates the Second Amendment.
3. Whether Louisiana's concealed-carry restrictions are unconstitutional under the Second Amendment.
4. Whether Congress may apply 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) to an allegedly intrastate firearm or a noncommercial firearm transfer under the Commerce Clause.
5. Whether Jackson stated a claim for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).

HOLDINGS

1. Jackson's rights were not fully restored for purposes of § 921(a)(20) because Louisiana law continued to restrict his ability to possess or carry a concealed firearm. That restriction triggered the statute's unless clause and left him subject to § 922(g)(1).
2. Jackson's as-applied Second Amendment challenges fail because historical analogues support disarming individuals whose prior offenses establish a nexus to violence and public safety.
3. Section 922(g)(1) is not limited to firearms transported across state lines or acquired through commercial transactions; its prohibition reaches possession of any firearm in or affecting commerce, and Congress may regulate intrastate firearm activity within the statutory scheme.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Based on the foregoing, the denial of Jackson’s purchase request in December 2024 was proper. He has failed to state a legally cognizable claim and the United States’s Rule 12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss (Record Document 36) is GRANTED.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jackson had prior Louisiana felony convictions for illegal use of a weapon and aggravated second degree battery. Although he had completed his sentences, completed supervision, and remained conviction-free for more than a decade, NICS denied his December 2024 attempt to purchase two firearms. Jackson argued that Louisiana's ten-year cleansing period restored his firearm rights, that § 922(g)(1) was unconstitutional as applied to him, and

that federal law could not regulate a firearm manufactured and retained in Louisiana or a noncommercial gift from his son.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jackson alleged that NICS denied his attempted purchase of two firearms because of his prior Louisiana felony convictions. He contended that his civil rights had been restored after completion of his sentences and the applicable ten-year period, that § 922(g)(1) was unconstitutional as applied to him, and that Congress lacked Commerce Clause authority over an intrastate firearm. The district court granted the United States' Rule 12(b)(6) motion and directed that judgment issue.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-56 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009)
- Colle v. Brazos County, 981 F.2d 237, 243 (5th Cir. 1993)
- Caron v. United States, 524 U.S. 308 (1998)
- United States v. Sam, No. CR 6:15-00254, 2016 WL 1600229, at *2 (W.D. La. Mar. 23, 2016)
- United States v. Chenowith, 459 F.3d 635, 636 (5th Cir. 2006)
- United States v. Thomas, 991 F.2d 206, 213 (5th Cir. 1993)
- United States v. Dupaquier, 74 F.3d 615, 617 (5th Cir. 1996)
- New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen, 597 U.S. 1, 24, 27, 29-30 (2022)
- United States v. Wilson, No. 22-238, 2024 WL 4436637, at *4
- United States v. Diaz, 116 F.4th 458, 466-470 (5th Cir. 2024)
- United States v. Rahimi, 602 U.S. 680, 700 (2024)
- United States v. Ezell, 2024 WL 4729314, at *2 (W.D. La. Nov. 8, 2024)
- United States v. Patino, No. 24-10080, 2025 WL 637429 (5th Cir. Feb. 27, 2025)
- United States v. Alcantar, 733 F.3d 143 (5th Cir. 2013)
- United States v. Wallace, 889 F.2d 580 (5th Cir. 1989)
- Hollis v. Lynch, 121 F. Supp. 3d 617 (N.D. Tex. 2015)
- Gonzales v. Raich, 545 U.S. 1, 17 (2005)
- United States v. Nelson, 458 F.2d 556, 559 (5th Cir. 1972)