

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-7005**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MARVIN HAROLD WITHERSPOON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Richard L. Voorhees, District Judge. (5:04-cr-00005-RLV-DCK-1; 5:10-cv-00076-RLV)

---

Submitted: September 30, 2010

Decided: October 12, 2010

---

Before NIEMEYER, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Marvin Harold Witherspoon, Appellant Pro Se. Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Marvin H. Witherspoon seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion 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); 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 Witherspoon 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