

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6422

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MARTINEOUS LEON HOPPER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Martin K. Reidinger, District Judge. (1:05-cr-00031-MR-2; 1:12-cv-00124-MR)

Submitted: July 25, 2013

Decided: July 29, 2013

Before GREGORY, DAVIS, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Martineous Leon Hopper, Appellant Pro Se. Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Jill Westmoreland Rose, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Asheville, North Carolina; Michael E. Savage, Assistant United States Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Martineous Leon Hopper seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his successive 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013) motion and dismissing on that basis. He also appeals from the order denying reconsideration of the dismissal. 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) (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 Hopper 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