

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-6460**

---

DERRICK LAVALLE WIGGINS,  
  
Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

PATRICIA STANSBERRY, Warden,  
  
Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District Judge. (3:10-cv-00298-HEH)

---

Submitted: August 18, 2011                      Decided: August 23, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON, DAVIS, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Derrick Lavalley Wiggins, Appellant Pro Se. Robin Perrin Meier, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Derrick Lavalley Wiggins seeks to appeal the district court's order construing his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2006) petition as a successive 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2011) motion, and dismissing it on that basis. 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 Wiggins 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