

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-7077**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DANIEL HOLMES, a/k/a Dan, a/k/a Big Dan,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort. Solomon Blatt, Jr., Senior District Judge. (9:04-cr-00429-SB-1; 9:12-cv-01311-SB)

---

Submitted: November 21, 2013

Decided: December 9, 2013

---

Before NIEMEYER, DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Daniel Holmes, Appellant Pro Se. Jimmie Ewing, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina; Eric John Klumb; Matthew J. Modica, Assistant United States Attorneys, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Daniel Holmes seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013) motion and denying his motion for reconsideration. Holmes' appeal may not proceed 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 Holmes 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

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

DISMISSED