

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-6740**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LLOYD ANTHONIE WILLIAMS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Lacy H. Thornburg, District Judge. (4:98-cr-00144-LHT-1; 1:06-cv-00193-LHT)

---

Submitted: October 30, 2008

Decided: January 12, 2009

---

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Lloyd Antonie Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Richard Ascik, Assistant United States Attorney, Jerry Wayne Miller, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lloyd Anthonie Williams seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West 2006 & West Supp. 2008) motion and his motion to reconsider. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (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) (2006). 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 Williams has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Williams' motions for 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