

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-7275**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JEFF ERIC CHESSER,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, District Judge. (3:07-cr-01392-CMC-1; 3:12-cv-01484-CMC)

---

Submitted: November 20, 2012

Decided: November 27, 2012

---

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and SHEDD and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jeff Eric Chesser, Appellant Pro Se. Jimmie Ewing, Assistant United States Attorney, Nancy Chastain Wicker, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jeff Eric Chesser seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as successive 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 Chesser has not made the requisite showing.\* Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal.

---

\* Chesser's motion also did not qualify for consideration under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2241 (West 2006 & Supp. 2012). In re Jones, 226 F.3d 328, 333-34 (4th Cir. 2000).

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