

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6788**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DONNELL COPPEDGE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (4:09-cr-00054-F-1; 4:12-cv-00249-F)

---

Submitted: October 22, 2013

Decided: October 24, 2013

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Donnell Coppedge, Appellant Pro Se. William Glenn Perry, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greenville, North Carolina; Rudy E. Renfer, Assistant United States Attorney, Shailika K. Shah, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Donnell Coppedge seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013) 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 Coppedge has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Coppedge's motion to appoint counsel. 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