

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6188

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TYRONE YOUNG,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Danville. James P. Jones, Senior District Judge. (4:18-cr-00017-JPJ-1, 4:22-cv-81506-JPJ)

Submitted: October 30, 2025

Decided: November 4, 2025

Before RUSHING and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tyrone Young, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tyrone Young appeals the district court's order construing Young's Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion and motions to amend as unauthorized, successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motions and dismissing them for lack of jurisdiction.* We have reviewed the record and discern no reversible error in the district court's construction of Young's motions as successive § 2255 motions over which it lacked jurisdiction because Young failed to obtain prefiling authorization from this court. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2244(b)(3)(A), 2255(h); *McRae*, 793 F.3d at 397-400. Accordingly, we deny Young's motion for appointment of counsel, and 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 Young's notice of appeal and informal briefs 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).