

**United States Court of Appeals  
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

---

No. 06-2346

---

United States of America,

Appellee,

v.

William Dennis Echols, also known as  
William D. Harris, also known as Larry  
W. Jones, also known as Larry D.  
Jones,

Appellant.

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

Appeal from the United States  
District Court for the  
District of Minnesota.

[UNPUBLISHED]

---

Submitted: July 18, 2007  
Filed: July 23, 2007

---

Before BYE, RILEY, and MELLOY, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

William D. Echols (Echols), who is serving a 235-month prison sentence imposed in 1997 after a jury found him guilty of a firearm offense, see United States v. Echols, 144 F.3d 584, 585 (8th Cir. 1998), unsuccessfully sought relief in the district court<sup>1</sup> under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), and then under Federal

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Richard H. Kyle, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), based on an alleged defect in his 1997 sentencing proceeding. Echols appeals the district court's adverse ruling, and we affirm. The district court correctly treated Echols's Rule 60(b) motion as a successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion filed without authorization. See United States v. Patton, 309 F.3d 1093, 1094 (8th Cir. 2002) (per curiam) (concluding inmates may not bypass the authorization requirement in 28 U.S.C. § 2244 for successive § 2255 motions by purporting to invoke some other procedure); Boyd v. United States, 304 F.3d 813, 814 (8th Cir. 2002) (per curiam) (same).

We affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

---