

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7792

CHRISTOPHER ANDRE S. W. QUINCER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

PETE MELETIS, Superintendent,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior
District Judge. (1:11-cv-01140-CMH-IDD)

Submitted: April 17, 2014 Decided: April 21, 2014

Before WILKINSON, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher Quincer, Appellant Pro Se. Wade Travis Anderson,
Kevin Osborne Barnard, Marcel H. Janoschka, John Chadwick
Johnson, FRITH, ANDERSON & PEAKE, PC, Roanoke, Virginia, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Andre S. W. Quincer seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 petition 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 Quincer has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in

forma pauperis, 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