

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6342

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

WILLIAM RUSSELL ABBOTT, a/k/a Rusty Abbott, a/k/a
panthers_one@yahoo.com, a/k/a bigruss912@hotmail.com

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior
District Judge. (2:07-cr-00214-JEB-1; 2:12-cv-00026-RGD)

Submitted: July 19, 2012

Decided: July 23, 2012

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William R. Abbott, Appellant Pro Se. Melissa Elaine O'Boyle,
Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Russell Abbott seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) 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.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Abbott 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