

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-6999

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LARRY LAMONT BUSH,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, District Judge.
(1:01-cr-00611-JFM-1; 1:06-cv-01631-AMD)

Submitted: January 19, 2011

Decided: February 1, 2011

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Larry Lamont Bush, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Reeves Harding, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Larry Lamont Bush seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion, in which he sought reopening of the appeal period in order that he might appeal the district court's September 24, 2007 order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) 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); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural 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 Bush has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny the

motion for appointment of counsel, 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