

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-4559**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM L. HANDY, JR., a/k/a B,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge. (8:04-cr-00559-AW-7; 8:09-cv-02011-AW; 8:13-cv-00477-AW)

---

Submitted: November 21, 2013

Decided: November 25, 2013

---

Before KING, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William L. Handy, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Sandra Wilkinson, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William L. Handy, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion for release on bail pending review of his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion, in which he seeks relief from the court's denial of his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013) motion.\* The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (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). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

---

\* The order is an immediately appealable collateral order. See Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 69 S. Ct. 1221, 93 L.Ed. 1528 (1949); Pagan v. United States, 353 F.3d 1343, 1345-46 & n.4 (11th Cir. 2003).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Handy 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED