UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 26-6313

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

EDWARD DANE JEFFUS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. William L. Osteen, Jr., District Judge. (6:92-cr-00184-WO-2; 1:24-cv-00789-WO-JEP)

Submitted: August 27, 2026 Decided: September 1, 2026

Before KING, HEYTENS, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Edward Dane Jeffus, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Edward Dane Jeffus appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and construing Jeffus's Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4) motion for relief from judgment as an unauthorized, successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion and dismissing it on that basis.[*] Our review of the record confirms that the district court properly construed Jeffus's Rule 60(b) motion as a successive § 2255 motion over which it lacked jurisdiction because Jeffus failed to obtain prefiling authorization from this court. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2244(b)(3)(A), 2255(h); *Gonzalez v. Crosby*, 545 U.S. 524, 531-32 (2005); *Bixby v. Stirling*, 90 F.4th 140, 149-52 (4th Cir. 2024). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order.

Consistent with our decision in *United States v. Winestock*, 340 F.3d 200, 208 (4th Cir. 2003), we construe Jeffus's notice of appeal and informal brief as an application to file a second or successive § 2255 motion. Upon review, we conclude that his claims do not meet the relevant standard. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h). We therefore 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

[*] A certificate of appealability is not required to appeal the district court's jurisdictional categorization of a Rule 60(b) motion as an unauthorized, successive § 2255 motion. *United States v. McRae*, 793 F.3d 392, 400 (4th Cir. 2015).