

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6502**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RAYMOND GARFIELD BUTLER,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, Senior District Judge. (1:08-cr-00442-JFM-4; 1:13-cv-03804-JFM)

---

Submitted: September 12, 2014      Decided: September 22, 2014

---

Before WILKINSON, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Raymond Garfield Butler, Appellant Pro Se. Christopher John Romano, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond Garfield Butler seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and his motion to alter or amend judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). The orders are 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 Butler has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Butler's motion for 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