

S.D.N.Y.–N.Y.C.
12-cr-152
17-cv-4723
McMahon, J.

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE
SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 12th day of October, two thousand twenty-one.

Present:

Pierre N. Leval,
Robert D. Sack,
Michael H. Park,
Circuit Judges.

Michael Binday,

Petitioner,

v.

21-1206

United States of America,

Respondent.

Petitioner moves for leave to file in district court a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion and/or 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition. He also moves for leave to file an oversized reply brief. Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the stay previously imposed by this Court is lifted, the motion to file an oversized reply brief is GRANTED, but the motion for leave to file a § 2255 motion and/or § 2241 petition is DENIED.

To the extent Petitioner’s claim should be brought under § 2255, it would be successive within the meaning of § 2255(h) because Petitioner’s first § 2255 motion challenged the same criminal judgment, was decided on the merits, and reached final adjudication before the filing of the present motion. *See Vu v. United States*, 648 F.3d 111, 113 (2d Cir. 2011); *Whab v. United States*, 408 F.3d 116, 118-19 (2d Cir. 2005). We reject Petitioner’s argument that a claim based on *Kelly v. United States*, 140 S. Ct. 1565 (2020), would not be successive because that decision announced new law that was previously unavailable; § 2255(h) clearly covers that circumstance and the cases cited by Petitioner are inapposite. Petitioner is not entitled to relief under § 2255(h) because he has not made a prima facie showing that *Kelly* announced “a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable,”

as required by § 2255(h)(2). *Kelly* interpreted a statute and did not rely on any constitutional provision.

Petitioner also has not made a showing that he is entitled to relief under § 2241 because he has not made a showing of actual innocence. *See Cephass v. Nash*, 328 F.3d 98, 104 (2d Cir. 2003) (stating standard for proceeding under § 2241 instead of § 2255); *Triestman v. United States*, 124 F.3d 361, 373–74 (2d Cir. 1997) (same). This Court has recently upheld the theory of conviction challenged by Petitioner, *United States v. Gatto*, 986 F.3d 104, 125–27 (2d Cir. 2021), *petition for cert. filed*, No. 21-169 (Aug. 2, 2021), and he has not otherwise shown that his case is covered by the ruling in *Kelly*.

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court


