**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-6516**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

NAKIA HEATH KELLER,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Harrisonburg. Glen E. Conrad, Chief District Judge. (5:10-cr-00015-GEC-RSB-2; 5:13-cv-80612-GEC-RSB)

---

Submitted: August 31, 2015 Decided: September 15, 2015

---

Before KING and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Nakia Heath Keller, Appellant Pro Se. Grayson A. Hoffman, Jeb Thomas Terrien, Assistant United States Attorneys, Harrisonburg, Virginia; Timothy J. Heaphy, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Roanoke, Virginia; Stephen John Pfleger, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlottesville, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nakia Heath Keller seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend that decision. 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 Keller has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Keller's motions to add evidence, to place the case in abeyance, and to amend his informal and supplemental briefs, 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