USA v. Williams Doc. 920080415

## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

**United States Court of Appeals** Fifth Circuit

> FILED April 15, 2008

No. 07-30640 Conference Calendar

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff-Appellee

V.

**VINCENT WILLIAMS** 

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana USDC No. 2:00-CR-129-2

Before PRADO, OWEN, and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:\*

Vincent Williams, federal prisoner #27040-034, appeals the district court's denial of his FED. R. CIV. P. 60(b)(4) motion for relief from a criminal order of forfeiture. Williams argues that his Rule 60(b)(4) motion was proper because he was raising a jurisdictional challenge to his conviction.

This court reviews a district court's ruling on a Rule 60(b)(4) motion de novo. Carter v. Fenner, 136 F.3d 1000, 1005 (5th Cir. 1998). Rule 60(b) provides relief from judgment in civil cases, not in criminal cases. See United States v.

<sup>\*</sup> Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

O'Keefe, 169 F.3d 281, 289 (5th Cir. 1999). Accordingly, the district court did not err in denying Williams's Rule 60(b) motion. Moreover, to the extent that Williams's Rule 60(b) motion was a successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion, Williams had not obtained the requisite authorization to file a successive § 2255 motion. See Gonzalez v. Crosby, 545 U.S. 524, 529-31 (2005); United States v. Rich, 141 F.3d 550, 551-53 (5th Cir. 1998); Fierro v. Johnson, 197 F.3d 147, 151 (5th Cir. 1999); 28 U.S.C. §§ 2244(b)(3)(A), 2255.

The district court's judgment is AFFIRMED.