

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6511

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MICHAEL R. JACKSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. John A. Gibney, Jr., District Judge. (3:93-cr-00125-JAG-1; 3:96-cv-01029-RLW)

Submitted: July 24, 2014

Decided: July 29, 2014

Before FLOYD and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael R. Jackson, Appellant Pro Se. Eric Matthew Hurt, Assistant United States Attorney, Newport News, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael R. Jackson seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of the 1999 denial of his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to reconsider the denial of the Rule 60(b) motion. 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); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 370 (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 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 Jackson 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