

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6466**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

STEVEN LAWRENCE HAWKINS, a/k/a Hawk,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:11-cr-00048-LMB-1; 1:16-cv-00131-LMB)

---

Submitted: June 23, 2016

Decided: June 29, 2016

---

Before MOTZ, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Steven Lawrence Hawkins, Appellant Pro Se. Philip Samuel Kaplan, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Steven Lawrence Hawkins seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and denying his motion for reconsideration pursuant to Federal Rule Civil Procedure 59(e). 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 Hawkins 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