UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7542

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

          Plaintiff - Appellee,

    v.

JOHNNY WILLIAM COOPER, JR., a/k/a Buck,

          Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (3:02-cr-00548-CMC-37; 3:14-cv-02200-CMC)

Submitted: March 22, 2017   Decided: June 13, 2017

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Johnny William Cooper, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Beth Drake, Acting United States Attorney, Jane Barrett Taylor, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Johnny William Cooper, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(d)(3) motion seeking relief from the district court's order denying Cooper's 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) 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) (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 Cooper 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