UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6692

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ARTHUR EDWARD WILLIAMSON, JR., a/k/a Fast Eddie,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Anderson. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (8:02-cr-00324-HMH-1; 8:15-cv-01094-HMH)

Submitted: October 28, 2015 Decided: November 5, 2015

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Arthur Edward Williamson, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Alan Lance Crick, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Arthur Williamson, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing as successive his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and denying his motion to reconsider 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 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 Williamson 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