

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 06-6129

---

WILLIAM RAYMOND TAYLOR,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

VANESSA P. ADAMS, Warden, Petersburg Federal  
Correctional Complex,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, District  
Judge. (3:05-cv-00684-REP)

---

Submitted: April 27, 2006

Decided: May 8, 2006

---

Before NIEMEYER and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William Raymond Taylor, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

William R. Taylor, a federal prisoner, appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2000), and his motion filed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error.\* Taylor is not entitled to proceed under § 2241 because 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) provides an effective and adequate remedy for his claims, see In re Vial, 115 F.3d 1192, 1194 n.5 (4th Cir. 1997) (procedural bar from filing § 2255 motion does not render § 2255 remedy inadequate or ineffective), and we find no abuse of the district court's discretion in its denial of Taylor's Rule 59(e) motion. See Temkin v. Frederick County Comm'rs, 945 F.2d 716, 724 (4th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, we grant Taylor's motion to proceed in forma pauperis and affirm. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

\*The district court construed the § 2241 petition as a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, and dismissed it as successive. Because Taylor clearly intended his petition as one under § 2241, we decline to consider the case under § 2255.