

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 25-3094

United States of America

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

Jajuan Antonio Jarmon

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Northern District of Iowa - Eastern

Submitted: August 12, 2026

Filed: August 19, 2026

[Unpublished]

Before GRASZ, ERICKSON, and STRAS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Jajuan Jarmon appeals the sentence the district court¹ imposed after he pled guilty to a drug offense. He maintains that the district court committed procedural

¹The Honorable Leonard T. Strand, United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa.

error at sentencing when it imposed an enhancement for possessing a weapon under U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1(b)(1), as the testimony from one of Jarmon’s drug customers that he provided a firearm to Jarmon in exchange for the cancellation of a drug debt and other narcotics was insufficient to support a finding that Jarmon possessed a firearm.

Upon careful review, we conclude that the district court did not err in imposing the enhancement. See United States v. Savage, 414 F.3d 964, 966 (8th Cir. 2005) (appellate court reviews district court’s findings of facts for clear error and its application of Guidelines de novo). The court did not clearly err in finding that Jarmon was traded a firearm to help pay a drug debt based on its decision to credit the customer’s testimony, because the customer’s account was not contradicted by external evidence or so internally inconsistent as to upset the credibility determination on appeal. See United States v. Denson, 138 F.4th 1091, 1095 (8th Cir. 2025) (per curiam) (district court did not clearly err in finding possession for purposes of § 2D1.1(b)(1) enhancement based on its decision to credit testimony from witnesses that defendant possessed firearms despite lack of prior gun conviction and lack of similar testimony from other witnesses; unless district court’s credibility assessments are contradicted by extrinsic evidence or internally inconsistent they can virtually never be clear error); see also United States v. Harris, 493 F.3d 928, 931-32 (8th Cir. 2007) (district court did not clearly err in finding weapon possession for purposes of § 2D1.1(b)(1) enhancement based on purportedly uncorroborated testimony from one witness that defendant attempted to trade him guns for drugs; district court observed witness testify and its “assessment of witness credibility is virtually unassailable on appeal”). Furthermore, the credited testimony provided a legal basis for the enhancement. See United States v. Martinez, 557 F.3d 597, 600 (8th Cir. 2009) (trade of gun for excusal of drug debt warrants § 2D1.1(b)(1) enhancement).

Accordingly, we affirm.
