UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6000

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAVID KEITH MILES,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, District Judge. (3:02-cr-00548-CMC-33; 3:10-cv-70223-CMC)

Submitted: May 19, 2011 Decided: May 23, 2011

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and AGEE and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David Keith Miles, Appellant Pro Se. Jane Barrett Taylor, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 403351469

Appeal: 11-6000 Document: 7 Date Filed: 05/23/2011 Page: 2 of 3

PER CURIAM:

David Keith Miles seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) 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 When the district court denies relief on procedural (2003).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. 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Miles 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

Appeal: 11-6000 Document: 7 Date Filed: 05/23/2011 Page: 3 of 3

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED