US v. Anthony Mangum

Appeal: 11-7525 Doc: 13 Filed: 05/08/2012 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 403890717

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-7525

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTHONY WAYNE MANGUM,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:06-cr-00058-NCT-1; 1:09-cv-00817-NCT-PTS)

Submitted: April 27, 2012 Decided: May 8, 2012

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Wayne Mangum, Appellant Pro Se. Angela Hewlett Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Wayne Mangum seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2011) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 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 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 Mangum 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 Appeal: 11-7525 Doc: 13 Filed: 05/08/2012 Pg: 3 of 3

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED