UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-6283

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAVID MICHAEL WOODWARD,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge. (4:02-cr-00673-TLW-1)

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

David Michael Woodward, Appellant Pro Se. William E. Day, II, Assistant United States Attorney, Florence, South Carolina, Winston David Holliday, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Submitted: August 27, 2009 Decided: October 1, 2009

PER CURIAM:

David Michael Woodward seeks to appeal the district court's order granting leave to amend his successive motion under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009), or petition this court for authorization to file a successive § 2255 motion. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2006), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2006); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The order Woodward seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.* We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

2

^{*} Although we express no opinion on the merits of the order Woodward seeks to appeal, we note that a resentencing under Fed. R. Crim. P. 35(b) does not restart the clock on the one-year limitations period for motions under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009). <u>United States v. Sanders</u>, 247 F.3d 139, 144 (4th Cir. 2001).