

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-6915

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM FELTON HARRIS, a/k/a Hulk Harris,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Wilmington. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (7:16-cr-00127-BO-1; 7:18-cv-00216-
BO)

Submitted: August 10, 2023

Decided: August 24, 2023

Before AGEE and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Felton Harris, Appellant Pro Se. Kristine L. Fritz, Assistant United States
Attorney, Jennifer P. May-Parker, Assistant United States Attorney, Katharine Paige
O'Hale, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES
ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Felton Harris appeals from the district court's order denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. We previously granted a certificate of appealability on the following claim: whether Harris's guilty plea should be vacated in light of *Rehaif v. United States*, 139 S. Ct. 2191 (2019). *Rehaif* was decided after the district court's order, and thus, this claim was raised for the first time on appeal. A certificate of appealability was denied as to all other claims. We now dismiss Harris's appeal.

Absent exceptional circumstances, we do not consider issues raised for the first time on appeal. *Pornomo v. United States*, 814 F.3d 681, 686 (4th Cir. 2016). Harris's *Rehaif* claim was presented in a conclusory manner with no supporting facts. In addition, he has not attempted to show exceptional circumstances. Given his barebones claim and his failure to provide this court with any further information or argument, we decline to consider this claim for the first time on appeal.

Accordingly, we dismiss Harris's appeal. 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.

DISMISSED