

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-7078

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

HOWARD CHARLES HUDSON, a/k/a Star, a/k/a Boss,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Arenda L. Wright Allen, District Judge. (2:93-cr-00156-AWA-JEB-1; 2:08-cv-00404-HCM)

Submitted: December 5, 2019

Decided: January 9, 2020

Before KEENAN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Howard Charles Hudson, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Howard Charles Hudson appeals the district court's order construing his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion as an unauthorized, successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and dismissing it on that basis. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *United States v. Hudson*, No. 2:93-cr-00156-AWA-JEB-1 (E.D. Va. July 16, 2019); *see United States v. McRae*, 793 F.3d 392, 400 (4th Cir. 2015) (holding certificate of appealability unnecessary where district court dismisses Rule 60(b) motion as unauthorized, successive habeas motion).

Consistent with our decision in *United States v. Winestock*, 340 F.3d 200, 208 (4th Cir. 2003), we construe Hudson's notice of appeal and informal brief as an application to file a second or successive § 2255 motion. Upon review, we find that Hudson's 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