UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6144

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff – Appellee,

v.

CRAIG ARNOLD SCOTT, a/k/a Craig Levi,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, Senior District Judge. (8:04-cr-00235-RWT-18)

Submitted: August 24, 2015 Decided: August 27, 2015

Before WILKINSON, SHEDD, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Craig Arnold Scott, Appellant Pro Se. Adam Kenneth Ake, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Bonnie S. Greenberg, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland; Mara Zusman Greenberg, Deborah A. Johnston, Assistant United States Attorneys, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Craig Arnold Scott seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion as an unauthorized, successive motion and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion. These 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 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 Scott 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