US v. Damon Dade Appeal: 13-6456 Doc: 11 Filed: 07/29/2013 Pg: 1 of 3 Doc. 404556908

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6456

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAMON DADE, a/k/a Johnny,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (1:99-cr-00425-JCC-1; 1:11-cv-00665-JCC)

Submitted: July 25, 2013 Decided: July 29, 2013

Before GREGORY, DAVIS, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Damon Dade, Appellant Pro Se. Alison Lynn Anderson, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Damon Dade seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013) motion as successive and unauthorized. The order is not appealable unless justice or judge issues a certificate 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 Dade 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

Appeal: 13-6456 Doc: 11 Filed: 07/29/2013 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED