UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

	No. 17-6391	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	. ,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
LINDA SUE NEWCOMB,		
Defendant - A	appellant.	
Appeal from the United States D Lynchburg. Norman K. Moon, 6:16-cv-81150-NKM-RSB)		•
Submitted: August 18, 2017		Decided: September 15, 2017
Before SHEDD and DIAZ, Circuit	Judges, and HAMIL	TON, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.	
David B. Hargett, HARGETT LAV P. Giorno, OFFICE OF THE UN Appellee.		•
Unpublished opinions are not bind	ing precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Linda Sue Newcomb seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on her 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 Newcomb 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