

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6555

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LEWIS MOSES BYRD,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Graham C. Mullen, Senior District Judge. (3:03-cr-00067-GCM-DCK-1; 3:08-cv-00257-GCM)

Submitted: July 18, 2013

Decided: July 23, 2013

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lewis Moses Byrd, Appellant Pro Se. Kimlani M. Ford, Assistant United States Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina, Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lewis Moses Byrd seeks to appeal the district court's orders construing his motion to amend his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013) motion as a successive § 2255 motion and dismissing it on that basis, and denying reconsideration of that order. The orders are 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.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Byrd 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