

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-6589**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JAMES M. DEBARDELEBEN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, District Judge. (1:84-cr-00043-WEB; 8:05-cv-03326-DKC)

---

Submitted: June 15, 2006

Decided: June 21, 2006

---

Before KING, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James M. DeBardleben, Appellant Pro Se. Juliet Ann Eurich, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

James M. DeBardleben seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as successive his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). 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) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that DeBardleben 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED