

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-7801**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

A. E. WILLIAMSON, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District Judge. (3:06-cv-02363-HMH)

---

Submitted: March 16, 2007

Decided: April 12, 2007

---

Before WILLIAMS, TRAXLER,\* and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

A. E. Williamson, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Alan Lance Crick, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

---

\*Judge Traxler was a member of the original panel but did not participate in consideration of this case. The opinion is filed by a quorum of the panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

PER CURIAM:

A. E. Williamson, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on 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 Williamson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, although we grant his motion to supplement his motion for a certificate of appealability, we deny Williamson's motion for 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