

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7555

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ROMAINE ABDUL SHORT,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Rebecca Beach Smith, Chief District Judge. (4:07-cr-00123-RBS-JEB-3; 4:14-cv-00061-RBS)

Submitted: February 12, 2015

Decided: February 19, 2015

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Romaine Abdul Short, Appellant Pro Se. Dana James Boente, Acting United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia; Lisa Rae McKeel, Howard Jacob Zlotnick, Assistant United States Attorneys, Newport News, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Romaine Abdul Short 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 Short has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny the motion for transcripts at government expense, and dismiss the appeal. We deny as moot Short's motion to place his case in abeyance. 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