

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 16-7153**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff – Appellee,

v.

JEFFREY GRANT PRYSOCK,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at  
Spartanburg. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (7:11-cr-00171-HMH-1;  
7:16-cv-02251-HMH)

---

Submitted: March 24, 2017

Decided: April 27, 2017

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and DUNCAN and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Benjamin T. Stepp, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greenville, South Carolina, for  
Appellant. Leesa Washington, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South  
Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jeffrey Grant Prysock 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 Prysock 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*