

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-6189**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHARLES WARD, a/k/a Chuck,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Martinsburg. John Preston Bailey, Chief District Judge. (3:09-cr-00032-JPB-JES-1; 3:11-cv-00042-JPB-JES)

---

Submitted: August 22, 2012

Decided: August 24, 2012

---

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and Diaz, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Charles Ward, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Oliver Mucklow, Assistant United States Attorney, Martinsburg, West Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles Ward seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting, in part, the recommendations of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) motion, as well as its order denying him a certificate of appealability. The district court's dismissal 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 Ward 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