

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6711

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTHONY MICHAEL BROWN, a/k/a Solo,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Richard L. Voorhees, District Judge. (5:05-cr-00009-RLV-DCK-18; 5:13-cv-00023-RLV)

Submitted: August 22, 2013

Decided: August 27, 2013

Before MOTZ, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Michael Brown, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas A. O'Malley, Maria Kathleen Vento, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina; Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Jill Westmoreland Rose, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Michael Brown 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 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 Brown 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