

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7232

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ISRAEL JUAREZ DELGADO, a/k/a Benito Bueno, a/k/a Benito Valencia, a/k/a El Gordo, a/k/a Benito Valencia-Bueno, a/k/a Beneito Bravo, a/k/a Benito Valencia-Brava,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (3:09-cr-00715-JFA-1; 3:11-cv-02637-JFA)

Submitted: December 13, 2012

Decided: December 21, 2012

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Israel Juarez Delgado, Appellant Pro Se. Mark C. Moore, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Israel Juarez Delgado seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion to reconsider the denial of relief on 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 Delgado 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED