IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-41462 Summary Calendar

DALTON LEE McEWEN,

Appellant,

versus

JOHN TOMBONE, Warden, Federal Correctional Complex Beaumont,

Respondent-

Petitioner-

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas USDC No. 1:99-CV-697

July 6, 2000

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, DEMOSS and STEWART, Circuit Judges:

PER CURIAM:*

Dalton Lee McEwen, a federal prisoner (# 09479-035), appeals from the district court's dismissal of his 28 U.S.C.

§ 2241 petition, in which McEwen challenged not the execution of his federal sentence but the constitutionality of his underlying criminal conviction. McEwen has argued that he may challenge

^{*} Pursuant to 5^{TH} CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5^{TH} CIR. R. 47.5.4.

his conviction in a § 2241 petition because his remedy under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is "inadequate or ineffective" due to the "serious" and "fundamental" constitutional violations at issue.

A prisoner may seek § 2241 relief if he can establish "that the remedy provided for under § 2255 is inadequate or ineffective to test the legality of his detention." <u>Cox v. Warden, Fed. Detention</u> <u>Ctr.</u>, 911 F.2d 1111, 1113 (5th Cir. 1990) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). A prior unsuccessful § 2255 motion is not, in and of itself, sufficient to establish the inadequacy or ineffectiveness of the remedy under § 2255. <u>McGhee v. Hanberry</u>, 604 F.2d 9, 10 (5th Cir. 1979). Moreover, a federal prisoner's inability to meet the requirements for filing a "second or successive" § 2255 motion does not make the remedy inadequate or ineffective. <u>See Tolliver v. Dobre</u>, __ F.3d _, No. 99-41420 (5th Cir. May 3, 2000), 2000 U.S. App. 8659 at *2. McEwen's § 2241 petition was only an attempt to circumvent the limitations on filing a successive § 2255 motion. Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.