

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-8004

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RONALD DEMETRIUS THOMAS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, Senior District Judge. (8:06-cr-00405-RWT-1; 8:11-cv-01049-RWT)

Submitted: May 18, 2016

Decided: May 20, 2016

Before SHEDD, DIAZ, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronald Demetrious Thomas, Appellant Pro Se. Arun G. Rao, Barbara Suzanne Skalla, Assistant United States Attorneys, Greenbelt, Maryland; Paul Nitze, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronald Demetrious Thomas seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. We have reviewed the record and conclude that Thomas' motion was not a true Rule 60(b) motion, but in substance a successive § 2255 motion. See United States v. McRae, 793 F.3d 392, 399-400 (4th Cir. 2015); see also Gonzalez v. Crosby, 545 U.S. 524, 531-32 (2005) (explaining how to differentiate a true Rule 60(b) motion from an unauthorized successive habeas motion). Thomas therefore is not required to obtain a certificate of appealability to appeal the district court's order. McRae, 793 F.3d at 400. In the absence of prefiling authorization from this court, the district court lacked jurisdiction to hear Thomas' successive § 2255 motion. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3) (2012).

Additionally, we construe Thomas' notice of appeal and informal brief as an application to file a second or successive § 2255 motion. 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 that would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that no reasonable factfinder would have found the movant guilty of the offense; or

(2) a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable. 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h). Thomas' claims do not satisfy either of these criteria. Therefore, we deny authorization to file a successive § 2255 motion. We affirm the district court's order. We also 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.

AFFIRMED