

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6097

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTHONY KEITH WILSON,

Defendant - Appellant,

v.

RANDY MARTIN; LUTHER BRYAN; ALISIA H. AKBAR; LACARIA BROWN;
GEORGEAN MCCONNELL; GUSSIE D. NOLLKAMPER; FLORENCE
NOLLKAMPER; PHYLLIS ROLAND; CHRISTOPHER M. MORRIS; LAVACA
COUNTY TEXAS; JOSEPH E. MCCONNELL; JOHN M. WARTHER; WELLS
FARGO HOME MORTGAGE, INCORPORATED; CHERYL L. AMAKER; DONNA
C. ADKINS; CHASE MANHATTAN MORTGAGE CORPORATION,

Parties-in-Interest.

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-10; 3:10-cv-70232-CMC)

Submitted: June 22, 2011

Decided: July 13, 2011

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Keith Wilson, Appellant Pro Se. Beth Drake, Mark C. Moore, Jane Barrett Taylor, Assistant United States Attorneys, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Keith Wilson seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion. The district court's order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (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 Wilson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss Wilson's 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