UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-7802

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LORENZO BUTTS, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Jerome B. Friedman, District Judge. (2:00-cr-00067-JBF-1)

Submitted: February 18, 2010 Decided: February 24, 2010

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lorenzo Butts, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Kevin Michael Comstock, Joseph Evan DePadilla, Assistant United States Attorneys, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lorenzo Butts, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order treating his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion as a successive 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009) motion, and dismissing it on that basis, and denying his motion for recusal. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Butts has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny the Government's motion to consolidate with Appeal No. 09-7803.

Additionally, we construe Butts's notice of appeal and informal brief as an application to file a second or successive

motion under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255. United States v. Winestock, 340 F.3d 200, 208 (4th Cir. 2003). In order to obtain authorization to file a successive § 2255 motion, a prisoner must assert claims based on either: (1) newly discovered evidence, not previously discoverable by due diligence, that would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that, but for constitutional error, no reasonable factfinder would have found the movant guilty of the offense; or (2) a new rule of constitutional law, previously unavailable, made retroactive by the Supreme Court to cases on collateral review. 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255(h) (West Supp. 2009). Butts's claims do not satisfy either of these criteria. Therefore, we deny authorization to file a successive § 2255 motion.

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