

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6087

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RICKY LEE GROVES,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:94-cr-00097-F-1; 5:15-cv-00224-F)

Submitted: August 25, 2016

Decided: August 29, 2016

Before NIEMEYER, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ricky Lee Groves, Appellant Pro Se. G. Norman Acker, III, Assistant United States Attorney, Seth Morgan Wood, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ricky Lee Groves seeks to appeal the district court's order granting in part his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion for reconsideration of a previous order dismissing as successive his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, and ultimately denying relief on the merits of the § 2255 motion. 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 Groves 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