

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6897

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

GREGORY A. MILTON, a/k/a G,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of Virginia, at Harrisonburg. Michael F. Urbanski,
District Judge. (5:95-cr-70074-MFU-1; 5:14-cv-80785-MFU-RSB)

Submitted: November 19, 2015

Decided: November 23, 2015

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gregory A. Milton, Appellant Pro Se. Anthony Paul Giorno,
United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gregory A. Milton seeks to appeal the district court's orders finding Milton's most recent 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion to be an unauthorized, successive § 2255 motion, and dismissing it for lack of jurisdiction, and denying Milton's Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend that order. 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 Milton 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