

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 20-7880

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ZIYAD YAGHI,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:09-cr-00216-FL-8; 5:15-cv-00523-FL)

Submitted: April 27, 2021

Decided: May 3, 2021

Before KEENAN, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ziyad Yaghi, Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer P. May-Parker, Assistant United States Attorney, Joshua L. Rogers, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Ziyad Yaghi appeals the district court's order construing his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for relief from judgment as an unauthorized, successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion and dismissing it for lack of jurisdiction.* Our review of the record confirms that the district court properly construed Yaghi's Rule 60(b) motion as a successive § 2255 motion over which it lacked jurisdiction because he 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 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 Yaghi's notice of appeal and informal briefs as an application to file a second or successive § 2255 motion. Upon review, we conclude that Yaghi'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

* 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).