

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7086

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BRANDON EMANUEL BUTLER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, Chief District Judge. (4:09-cr-00074-TLW-1; 4:14-cv-00112-TLW)

Submitted: November 17, 2015

Decided: November 20, 2015

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Brandon Emanuel Butler, Appellant Pro Se. Carrie Fisher Sherard, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Brandon Emanuel Butler seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion as untimely filed. The order is 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 Butler has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Butler's motion for 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