

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-6952**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RYAN EDWIN HEADDEN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (7:01-cr-00126-F-1; 7:04-cv-00035-F)

---

Submitted: March 22, 2010

Decided: May 6, 2010

---

Before MICHAEL,\* MOTZ, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Ryan Edwin Headden, Appellant Pro Se. George Edward Bell Holding, United States Attorney, Steve R. Matheny, Ethan A. Ontjes, Rudolf A. Renfer, Jr., Assistant United States Attorneys, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

---

\* Judge Michael was a member of the original panel but did not participate in this decision. This opinion is filed by a quorum of the panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ryan Edwin Headden seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). 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 Headden 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