US v. Eric Dixon Appeal: 13-6896 Doc: 5 Filed: 09/30/2013 Pg: 1 of 3 Doc. 404651004

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6896

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ERIC BERNARD DIXON, a/k/a Fat Cat,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Patrick Michael Duffy, Senior District Judge. (2:10-cr-00649-PMD-1; 2:13-cv-00300-PMD)

Submitted: September 26, 2013 Decided: September 30, 2013

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eric Bernard Dixon, Appellant Pro Se. Matthew J. Modica, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eric Bernard Dixon 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 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. <u>Cockrell</u>, 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 Dixon 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: 13-6896 Doc: 5 Filed: 09/30/2013 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED