<u>**UNPUBLISHED**</u>

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 10-6209
_____

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

    Plaintiff - Appellee,

  v.

PATRICK KIT PLUMLEE,

    Defendant - Appellant.

_____

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News.   Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (4:94-cr-00002-2; 4:07-cv-00049-RAJ)

_____

Submitted: April 22, 2010   Decided: April 28, 2010

_____

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and KING and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

_____

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

_____

Patrick Kit Plumlee, Appellant Pro Se. Kevin Michael Comstock, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, Stephen Wiley Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

_____

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Patrick Kit Plumlee seeks to appeal the district court's order construing Plumlee's Fed. R. Crim. P. 35(a) motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009) and dismissing it as successive. 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). 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 Plumlee 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