

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-7335**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WAYNE PORTER,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Richard L. Voorhees, District Judge. (3:85-cr-00062-RLV-1; 3:14-cv-00373-RLV)

---

Submitted: March 19, 2015

Decided: March 24, 2015

---

Before WILKINSON and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Wayne Porter, Appellant Pro Se. Richard Lee Edwards, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Wayne Porter seeks to appeal the district court's order construing his filing as a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and dismissing it as successive.\* 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 Porter has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma

---

\* We reject Porter's claim that his challenge was cognizable under former Fed. R. Crim. P. 35(a). See United States v. Little, 392 F.3d 671, 678 (4th Cir. 2004).

pauperis, 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