

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6960**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MARCOS GALINDO-XOCHIHUA, a/k/a

Sld Dft 2:04m85-1, a/k/a

Mickey Galindo, a/k/a Manuel,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Bryson City. Martin K. Reidinger, District Judge. (2:05-cr-00003-MR-DLH-1; 2:13-cv-00051-MR)

---

Submitted: November 20, 2014

Decided: November 25, 2014

---

Before KING and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Marcos Galindo-Xochihua, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Richard Ascik, Donald David Gast, Assistant United States Attorneys, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Marcos Galindo-Xochihua seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely 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 Galindo-Xochihua 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