



We have reviewed the record, and agree with the district court that Martin's current motion is successive, because both grounds for relief were rejected in his earlier motion. We also agree that Martin has not shown his abuse of the writ should be excused. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(a); McCleskey v. Zant, 499 U.S. 467, 493-94 (1991).

Accordingly, the judgment is affirmed.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U. S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.