US v. Sterling Green
Appeal: 11-7665 Document: 8 Date Filed: 02/23/2012 Page: 1 of 3

Doc. 403773665

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-7665

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

STERLING VERNARD GREEN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge. (4:06-cr-01322-TLW-4; 4:11-cv-70078-TLW)

Submitted: February 16, 2012 Decided: February 23, 2012

Before SHEDD, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sterling Vernard Green, Appellant Pro Se. Alfred William Walker Bethea, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sterling Vernard Green seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely 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. 28 \S 2253(c)(1)(B) (2006). A certificate U.S.C. appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists that the district court's assessment would find 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 Green 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: 11-7665 Document: 8 Date Filed: 02/23/2012 Page: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED