

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6533**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ORILLION CRADDOCK,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:08-cr-00049-REP-1; 3:16-cv-00183-REP)

---

Submitted: July 28, 2016

Decided: August 2, 2016

---

Before MOTZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Orillion Craddock, Appellant Pro Se. Stephen Wiley Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Orillion Craddock appeals the district court's order treating his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion as a successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, and dismissing it on that basis. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. United States v. Craddock, No. 3:08-cr-00049-REP-1 (E.D. Va. Mar. 23, 2016).

Additionally, we construe Craddock's 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). Craddock'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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED