

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6075**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SIDNEY EDWARD HUDDLESTON, III, a/k/a Eddy, a/k/a Sidney E.  
Huddleston, III,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern  
District of West Virginia, at Huntington. Robert C. Chambers,  
Chief District Judge. (3:10-cr-00042-1; 3:11-cv-00403)

---

Submitted: April 25, 2013

Decided: April 30, 2013

---

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

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Sidney Edward Huddleston, III, Appellant Pro Se. Lisa Grimes  
Johnston, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, West  
Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sidney Edward Huddleston, III, seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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 Huddleston 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