UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-8113

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHRISTOPHER FERGUSON, a/k/a Mark, a/k/a Mark Thompson,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:03-cr-00345-LDW-2; 1:09-cv-00686-CMH)

Submitted: June 1, 2010

Before GREGORY, SHEDD, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher Ferguson, Appellant Pro Se. Daniel Joseph Grooms, III, Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Decided: June 7, 2010

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Ferguson seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). 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) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 When the district court denies relief on procedural (2003).grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Ferguson 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

2

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED