

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7175

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DONALD ELBERT LEWIS, a/k/a Peptone,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (4:12-cr-00068-FL-2; 4:13-cv-00182-FL)

Submitted: December 17, 2015

Decided: December 22, 2015

Before DIAZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Donald Elbert Lewis, Appellant Pro Se. Augustus D. Willis, Seth Morgan Wood, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Donald Elbert Lewis seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and denying his motion for reconsideration. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 Lewis has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Lewis' motions to dismiss the appeal pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 42(b) and for a mental and emotional evaluation. 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