UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————————

No. 06-6258

———————————

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

                                        Plaintiff - Appellee,

        versus

RODNEY LAMARK MCGILL,

                                        Defendant - Appellant.

———————————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Cameron McGowan Currie, District
Judge. (0:99-cr-00659-CMC-9; 0:05-cv-00821-CMC)

———————————

Submitted: May 18, 2006   Decided: June 1, 2006

———————————

Before WIDENER and WILKINSON, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

———————————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————————

Rodney Lamark McGill, Appellant Pro Se. Marshall Prince, OFFICE OF
THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

———————————

PER CURIAM:

Rodney Lamark McGill seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion, and his motion for reconsideration of that denial filed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) (2000). 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 the district court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are likewise debatable. See 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 McGill has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we 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

- 2 -