

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-6114**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

NAMOND EARL WILLIAMS, a/k/a Tony Smith, a/k/a  
Namond Brewington,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, District Judge. (CR-  
90-135, CA-97-1256-JFM)

---

Submitted: June 20, 2002

Decided: July 10, 2002

---

Before LUTTIG, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Namond Earl Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Andrea L. Smith, OFFICE OF  
THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Namond Earl Williams seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion challenging the district court's prior denial of his motion filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2001), and the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion requesting reconsideration of the court's denial of the Rule 60(b) motion. We have reviewed the record and find that the Rule 60(b) motion, filed nearly four years after the denial of the underlying § 2255 motion, is untimely. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). We also find that Williams' Rule 59(e) motion does not establish an appropriate ground for reconsideration. See Collision v. International Chem. Workers Union, Local 217, 34 F.3d 233, 236 (4th Cir. 1994) (quoting Hutchinson v. Staton, 994 F.2d 1076, 1081 (4th Cir. 1993)). Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral arguments because the facts and legal contentions in the materials before the court are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED