

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6603

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHRISTOPHER MARSHALL,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. James K. Bredar, District Judge.
(1:11-cr-00488-JKB-2; 1:13-cv-01910-JKB)

Submitted: August 21, 2014

Decided: August 26, 2014

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher Marshall, Appellant Pro Se. Clinton Jacob Fuchs,
Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Marshall seeks to appeal the district court's order affirming its prior order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, and its order granting in part his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion and reaffirming the denial of § 2255 relief. These 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 Marshall 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