UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

**No. 06-6697**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

                                        Plaintiff - Appellee,

        versus

ANTHONY MOORE,

                                        Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk.   Jerome B. Friedman, District Judge.   (2:02-cr-00225-JBF; 2:05-cv-00244-JFB)

Submitted:    June 6, 2007          Decided:  July 9, 2007

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Moore, Appellant Pro Se. Darryl James Mitchell, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Moore seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion and his subsequent motion to reconsider pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). The orders are 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 Moore has not made the requisite showing.  Accordingly, we deny Moore's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal.  We deny as moot Moore's motions for abeyance and deny his motion to appoint appellate counsel.  Finally, 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