

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-8235

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JEFFREY A. HOPKINS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Frank D. Whitney, District Judge. (3:04-cr-00267-FDW-DCK-1; 3:04-cr-00268-FDW-CH-1; 3:09-cv-00227-FDW)

Submitted: February 25, 2010

Decided: March 5, 2010

Before DUNCAN and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeffrey A. Hopkins, Appellant Pro Se. Michael E. Savage, Assistant United States Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jeffrey A. Hopkins seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing as untimely filed his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009) motion, denying his motion for a certificate of appealability, and denying his subsequent motion for reconsideration of the order denying a certificate of appealability. The orders are 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 Hopkins 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