## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| •  |                       |                           |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|
|  | No. 17-7471           |                           |
| ISSAC LAMONT WILLIAMS,   |                       |                           |
| Petitioner - Ap  | opellant,             |                           |
| v.   |                       |                           |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA   | ••                    |                           |
| Respondent -   | Appellee.             |                           |
|  |                       |                           |
| Appeal from the United States Dist<br>Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder              |                       |                           |
| Submitted: March 29, 2018  |                       | Decided: April 2, 2018    |
| Before AGEE and DIAZ, Circuit J  | udges, and HAMILT     | ON, Senior Circuit Judge. |
| Affirmed by unpublished per curia  | m opinion.            |                           |
| Issac Lamont Williams, Appellant Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UTCArolina, for Appellee. |                       |                           |
| Unpublished opinions are not bind  | ing precedent in this | circuit.                  |

## PER CURIAM:

Issac Lamont Williams appeals the district court's order and judgment, adopting the magistrate judge's report and recommendation, construing his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2012) petition challenging his sentence as a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, and dismissing it as successive and without authorization from this court. Williams contends on appeal that § 2255 is inadequate or ineffective to test the legality of his detention, arguing that his challenge to his sentence under *Mathis v. United States*, 136 S. Ct. 2243 (2016), should be considered under § 2241. Williams has failed to satisfy his burden of demonstrating that § 2255 is an inadequate or ineffective means of challenging the validity of his detention. *See Rice v. Rivera*, 617 F.3d 802, 807 (4th Cir. 2010); *United States v. Poole*, 531 F.3d 263, 267 n.7 (4th Cir. 2008). Because the district court lacked jurisdiction over Williams' petition, we affirm the court's dismissal. 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**