

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6560

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SHELLY WAYNE MARTIN, a/k/a Wayne,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, Senior District Judge. (1:04-cr-00029-JFM-3; 1:16-cv-00109-JFM)

Submitted: September 13, 2016

Decided: September 15, 2016

Before TRAXLER, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Shelly Wayne Martin, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Clayton Hanlon, Robert Reeves Harding, Assistant United States Attorneys, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Shelly Wayne Martin seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying Martin's self-styled "Motion Under the Declaratory Judgment Act of 28 U.S.C. § 2201," construing this motion as a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and dismissing it for lack of jurisdiction because it was a successive § 2255 motion for which Martin had not received prefiling authorization, and denying Martin's Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend judgment. 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 Martin 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