

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-6278**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

PAUL RAYMOND GREEN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge. (8:09-cr-00230-AW-1; 8:10-cv-02749-AW)

---

Submitted: June 30, 2011

Decided: July 6, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Paul Raymond Green, Appellant Pro Se. Jessica Dunsay Silver, Lisa J. Stark, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, DC, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Paul Raymond Green seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely 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. Because Green failed to challenge on appeal the district court's timeliness ruling, we conclude that he 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 before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED