

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-6839

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-00009-GLR-1)

Submitted: December 21, 2021

Decided: December 22, 2021

Before KING and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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 appeals the district court's orders denying his petitions for writs of error coram nobis, in part, as successive and unauthorized 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motions, and in part for failing to state a colorable claim for coram nobis relief. A certificate of appealability is not required to address the district court's jurisdictional dismissal of Gill's petitions as successive § 2255 motions. *See United States v. McRae*, 793 F.3d 392, 400 (4th Cir. 2015).

We conclude that the district court properly construed Gill's requests for coram nobis relief as successive § 2255 motions over which it lacked jurisdiction. *See Gonzalez v. Crosby*, 545 U.S. 524, 531-32 (2005). Nor do we discern any error in the court's ruling that Gill was not entitled to coram nobis relief. *See United States v. Akinsade*, 686 F.3d 248, 252 (4th Cir. 2012) (discussing requirements for coram nobis relief); *United States v. Gamboa*, 608 F.3d 492, 495 (9th Cir. 2010) (“[T]he statutory limits on second or successive habeas petitions do not create a ‘gap’ in the post-conviction landscape that can be filled with the common law writs.” (internal block quotation omitted)). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. *United States v. Gill*, No. 1:86-cr-00009-GLR-1 (D. Md. May 13, 2021; July 20, 2021). 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