

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-7008**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

HANK AARON JOHNSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Robert J. Conrad, Jr., Chief District Judge. (3:06-cr-00185-RJC-1; 3:09-cv-00477-RJC)

---

Submitted: October 31, 2013

Decided: November 20, 2013

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Hank Aaron Johnson, Appellant Pro Se. Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina; Dana Owen Washington, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Hank Aaron Johnson seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as successive his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of the denial of 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 Johnson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Johnson's motion to supplement the record, 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