

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-6002**

---

ANTHONY D. WILLIAMSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Samuel G. Wilson, District Judge. (CA-97-405-R)

---

Submitted: June 22, 2006

Decided: June 28, 2006

---

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Anthony D. Williamson, Appellant Pro Se. Karen Breeding Peters, Assistant United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Anthony D. Williamson seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion seeking reconsideration of the district court's denial of his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Williamson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny his motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal, deny a certificate of appealability, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED