

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-6061**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHARLES PYNE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District Judge. (8:04-cr-00018-DKC-3)

---

Submitted: August 10, 2015

Decided: December 11, 2015

---

Before NIEMEYER, GREGORY, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Charles Pyne, Appellant Pro Se. Barbara Suzanne Skalla, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles Pyne seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his July 23, 2014 motion for reconsideration of the court's August 30, 2007 order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and March 27, 2014 order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(d)(3) 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 Pyne 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