UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-7461

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CLAUDE WENDELL BELLAMY,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (7:99-cr-00049-F-1)

Submitted: January 13, 2011 Decided: January 21, 2011

Before MOTZ, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Claude Wendell Bellamy, Appellant Pro Se. John Samuel Bowler, Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Claude Wendell Bellamy seeks to appeal the district court's order treating his motion for a certificate of appealability as a successive 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion, and dismissing it on that basis. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues 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 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 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 Bellamy has not made the requisite showing.

Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal.

DISMISSED