

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6415

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ROBERT LEE MCQUEEN, a/k/a Preacher,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:09-cr-00253-F-1; 5:12-cv-00693-F)

Submitted: August 30, 2016

Decided: September 8, 2016

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, MOTZ, Circuit Judge, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Robert Lee McQueen, Appellant Pro Se. Kristine L. Fritz, Tobin Webb Lathan, Seth Morgan Wood, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Rudolf A. Renfer, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Robert Lee McQueen seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) 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 McQueen has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny McQueen's motions for a copy of the transcript of the evidentiary hearing and for an emergency medical procedure, both at the Government's expense, and to amend his petition for a certificate of appealability. 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