US v. Lionel William Appeal: 13-6930 Doc: 7 Filed: 09/04/2013 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6930

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LIONEL ELIZAH WILLIAMS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (2:90-cr-00149-RGD-2; 2:13-cv-00005-RGD)

Submitted: August 29, 2013 Decided: September 4, 2013

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lionel Elizah Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Neil Harvey MacBride, United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 404611967

## PER CURIAM:

Lionel Elizah Williams seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013) motion as successive. 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 jurists would find that the district court's reasonable 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 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 Williams 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: 13-6930 Doc: 7 Filed: 09/04/2013 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED