

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6229

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ADAM JOE LOUIS JORDAN, III,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Richard L. Voorhees, District Judge. (5:11-cr-00011-RLV-DSC-1; 5:14-cv-00090-RLV)

Submitted: June 18, 2015

Decided: June 22, 2015

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Adam Joe Louis Jordan, III, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Richard Ascik, Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorneys, Asheville, North Carolina; William Michael Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, Dana Owen Washington, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Adam Joe Louis Jordan, III, seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. 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 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 Jordan 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