

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6666

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

THOMAS DONNELL SIFFORD,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Robert J. Conrad, Jr., District Judge. (3:07-cr-00097-RJC-1; 3:14-cv-00001-RJC)

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Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas Donnell Sifford, Appellant Pro Se. Keith Michael Cave, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Thomas Donnell Sifford seeks to appeal the district court's order denying as successive and unauthorized 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 Sifford has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Sifford's motion to expedite as moot, 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