

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-6868**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

NIGEL CLARKE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Malcolm J. Howard, Senior District Judge. (4:02-cr-00060-5-H; 4:07-cv-00020-H)

---

Submitted: August 30, 2007

Decided: September 10, 2007

---

Before MICHAEL, KING, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Nigel Clarke, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nigel Clarke seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion and denying his motion filed under 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 Clarke has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Clarke's motion to return the case to district court and 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