

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-7368**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RAYMOND YEAGER, a/k/a lookclookclookc,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Martin K. Reidinger, District Judge. (1:09-cr-00099-MR-1; 1:12-cv-00021-MR)

---

Submitted: February 27, 2014

Decided: March 4, 2014

---

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Raymond Yeager, Appellant Pro Se. William Michael Miller, Cortney Randall, Assistant United States Attorneys, Charlotte, North Carolina; Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond Yeager seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) 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) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 Yeager has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We further deny Yeager's motion for transcript at government expense and his supplemental motion for "transcripts, notes, and copies of communications" at government expense. 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