

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-6191**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM JEROME JORDAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Solomon Blatt, Jr., Senior District Judge. (2:06-cv-00137-SB)

---

Submitted: July 31, 2008

Decided: August 7, 2008

---

Before NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William Jerome Jordan, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Hayden Bickerton, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Jerome Jordan seeks to appeal the district court's order denying 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 Jordan has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Jordan's motion to proceed in forma pauperis, deny a certificate of appealability, and dismiss the appeal. In light of this disposition, we also deny Jordan's motion for preparation of transcripts at government expense. 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