

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-6887

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RAYMOND EDWARD GILL,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
George L. Russell, III, District Judge. (1:86-cr-00231-GLR-1)

Submitted: November 16, 2023

Decided: November 22, 2023

Before AGEE and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Raymond Edward Gill, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond Edward Gill, a federal prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing several motions filed in the underlying criminal case. In his motions, Gill asserted that he was entitled to coram nobis relief from his prior federal convictions. The district court determined that Gill was not entitled to coram nobis relief, construed the vast majority of Gill's motions as successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motions and dismissed the motions as unauthorized, and denied Gill's remaining motions. We dismiss in part and affirm in part.

To the extent Gill seeks to appeal the district court's dismissal of his motions as successive and unauthorized § 2255 motions, we conclude that he has failed to make the requisite showing for a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B); *Miller–El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000); *United States v. Winestock*, 340 F.3d 200, 205-06 (4th Cir. 2003). Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal in part.

To the extent that Gill appeals the district court's denial of his alternate claims for relief, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the remainder of the district court's order. *United States v. Gill*, No. 1:86-cr-00231-GLR-1 (D. Md. May 4, 2023). 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.

*DISMISSED IN PART,
AFFIRMED IN PART*