US v. Robert White Appeal: 14-7878 Doc: 22 Filed: 09/11/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 405621906

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7878

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ROBERT WHITE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Patrick Michael Duffy, Senior District Judge. (2:00-cr-00022-PMD-1; 2:14-cv-03761-PMD)

Submitted: September 9, 2015 Decided: September 11, 2015

Before SHEDD, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Robert G. White, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Nicholas Bianchi, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Robert White seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his motion to disqualify the district court judge, dismissing as successive his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, and denying his motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). The 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 district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 debatable or wrong. (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 White 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

Appeal: 14-7878 Doc: 22 Filed: 09/11/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED