

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7450

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

HENRY RAYFORD PRIVETTE, JR., a/k/a H. R. Privette, a/k/a Ray Picard, d/b/a Carolina Furniture, Incorporated, d/b/a carolinafurniture.com, d/b/a Henry Ray Furniture Export, Incorporated, d/b/a Carolina Furniture Factory Direct from High Point, NC, Incorporated, d/b/a Miller Burns International Home Furnishings, Ltd.,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (7:07-cr-00133-BO-1; 7:11-cv-00145-BO)

Submitted: December 20, 2012 Decided: January 14, 2013

Before NIEMEYER and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Henry Rayford Privette, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer P. May-Parker, Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Henry Rayford Privette, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) motion and denying his motion for reconsideration. The orders are 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 Privette has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny the motion for 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