US v. Billy Felder Doc. 403103691

Case: 10-7215 Document: 11 Date Filed: 12/07/2010 Page: 1

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-7215

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BILLY RAY FELDER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:08-cr-00295-BO-2; 5:09-cv-00385-BO; 5:10-cv-00095-BO)

Submitted: November 30, 2010 Decided: December 7, 2010

Before WILKINSON, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Billy Ray Felder, Appellant Pro Se. Edward D. Gray, Jennifer P. May-Parker, Assistant United States Attorneys, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Case: 10-7215 Document: 11 Date Filed: 12/07/2010 Page: 2

PER CURIAM:

Billy Ray Felder seeks to appeal the district court's 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. § 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 Felder has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Felder's motion for 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