

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7546

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RONNIE GERALD BELT,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia,
at Elkins. John Preston Bailey, District Judge. (2:13-cr-00030-JPB-RWT-1; 2:15-cv-
00087-JPB-RWT)

Submitted: March 30, 2017

Decided: April 4, 2017

Before TRAXLER and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronnie Gerald Belt, Appellant Pro Se. Stephen Donald Warner, Assistant United States
Attorney, Elkins, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronnie Gerald Belt seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Belt's 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend the judgment. 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 Belt 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