

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7683**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

EDWARD DANE JEFFUS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Senior District Judge. (6:92-cr-00184-NCT-2)

---

Submitted: April 21, 2016

Decided: May 4, 2016

---

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Edward Dane Jeffus, Appellant Pro Se. Angela Hewlett Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Edward Dane Jeffus seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the recommendation of the magistrate judge, denying Jeffus' Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend the court's January 15, 2015 order, and denying Jeffus' Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4) motion seeking relief from the court's February 11, 1997 judgment. 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 Jeffus has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Jeffus' motion for a certificate of appealability, deny leave to

proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss the appeal. We also deny Jeffus' motion for appointment of counsel along with all his numerous pending motions. 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