

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7612

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DWIGHT JULIUS FULTON, a/k/a DJ,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. James K. Bredar, District Judge. (1:10-cr-00022-JKB-2; 1:11-cv-02870-JKB)

Submitted: December 13, 2012

Decided: December 19, 2012

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dwight Julius Fulton, Appellant Pro Se. Mushtaq Zakir Gunja, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dwight Julius Fulton 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 Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion without prejudice. 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). 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 Fulton 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