

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-8115**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CRAIG LAMONT BROWN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Mark S. Davis, District Judge. (2:05-cr-00017-WDK-TEM; 2:07-cv-00156-WDK)

---

Submitted: January 15, 2009

Decided: January 26, 2009

---

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

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Craig Lamont Brown, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Calvin Moore, Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Craig Lamont Brown seeks to appeal two orders filed in his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) action denying his motions for relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). In the first order, the district court found that all but one of his claims were successive. In the second order, the court denied his remaining claim under Rule 60(b) itself. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Brown has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal.

Additionally, to the extent that Brown seeks to raise successive claims, we construe his notice of appeal and informal brief as an application to file a second or successive motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. 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) a new rule of constitutional law, previously unavailable, made retroactive by the Supreme Court to cases on collateral review; or (2) newly discovered evidence, not previously discoverable by due diligence, that would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that, but for constitutional error, no reasonable factfinder would have found the movant guilty of the offense. 28 U.S.C. §§ 2244(b)(2), 2255 (2000). Brown'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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED