

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-8066

RAYMOND CHERISSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:94-cr-00097-BO-14)

Submitted: July 20, 2007

Decided: August 8, 2007

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Raymond Cherisson, Appellant Pro Se. Christine Blaise Hamilton, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond Cherisson seeks to appeal the district court's order construing his "Omnibus Motion to Modify Term of Imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)" pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000), and denying relief. He further seeks to appeal the district court's dismissal of his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion for reconsideration of that denial of relief. 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 Cherisson 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