

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-7029

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KIM A. PRATER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Abingdon. James P. Jones, District Judge. (1:03-cr-00075-jpj-mfu-1; 1:01-cr-00018-jpj-1)

Submitted: November 18, 2010

Decided: December 1, 2010

Before SHEDD and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed in part; dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kim A. Prater, Appellant Pro Se. Steven Randall Ramseyer, Assistant United States Attorney, Abingdon, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kim A. Prater appeals the district court's order denying his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c) (2006) motion for a sentence reduction. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. United States v. Prater, Nos. 1:03-cr-00075-jpj-mf-1; 1:01-cr-00018-jpj-1 (W.D. Va. June 18, 2010).

Prater also appeals the denial of 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). 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 Prater 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.

AFFIRMED IN PART;
DISMISSED IN PART