

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6268

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KEVIN WAYNE MCDANIELS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Spartanburg. Henry F. Floyd, District Judge. (7:06-cr-00036-HFF-1; 7:10-cv-70201-HFF)

Submitted: June 30, 2011

Decided: July 6, 2011

Before WILKINSON, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kevin Wayne McDaniels, Appellant Pro Se. Alan Lance Crick, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kevin Wayne McDaniels 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. 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 McDaniels has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny McDaniels' motions for appointment of counsel, to compel the district court to produce certain exhibits, and for a mental health evaluation, and 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