UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7735

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CLAUDE SLOAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Big Stone Gap. James P. Jones, District Judge. (2:00-cr-10101-JPJ-1; 2:12-cv-80524-JPJ-RSB)

Submitted: December 11, 2012 Decided: December 21, 2012

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

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Claude Sloan, Appellant Pro Se. Steven Randall Ramseyer, Assistant United States Attorney, Abingdon, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Claude Sloan seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or motion. 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 а 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 When the district court denies relief on procedural (2003).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 Sloan has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in formal pauperis, deny a certificate of appealability, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral

2

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