

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6858**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DUJUAN FARROW,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:04-cr-00278-REP-2; 3:13-cv-00303-REP)

---

Submitted: October 17, 2013

Decided: October 21, 2013

---

Before AGEE, DAVIS, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Dujuan Farrow, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Ronald Gill, Angela Mastandrea-Miller, Assistant United States Attorneys, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dajuan Farrow seeks to appeal the district court's order treating his motion to correct his conviction and sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (2006) as a successive 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013) motion, and dismissing it on that basis. 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 Farrow has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Farrow's motion to amend or correct his informal brief, 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