

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7916

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DARYL F. LOCUST, a/k/a Derek Locust, a/k/a 8, a/k/a Daryl
Frank Locusts,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Newport News. Rebecca Beach Smith,
Chief District Judge. (4:06-cr-00040-RBS-TEM-1; 4:09-cv-00141-
RBS)

Submitted: March 28, 2013

Decided: April 1, 2013

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Daryl F. Locust, Appellant Pro Se. Timothy Richard Murphy,
Special Assistant United States Attorney, Newport News,
Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Daryl F. Locust seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of the district court's order denying 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 Locust 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