UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-8117

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JEFFREY PATRICK FRYE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. David C. Norton, District Judge. (2:09-cr-00291-DCN-1; 2:12-cv-00734-DCN)

Submitted: February 21, 2013 Decided: February 26, 2013

Before AGEE and DAVIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeffrey Patrick Frye, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Nicholas Bianchi, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Dockets.Justia.com

PER CURIAM:

Jeffrey Patrick Frye seeks to appeal the district order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. court's § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2006). certificate U.S.C. А 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 that the district court's assessment would find 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 Frye 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

2

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED