Appeal: 16-6862 Doc: 5 Filed: 11/22/2016 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6862

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WAYNE D. THOMPSON, a/k/a Buck Naked, a/k/a Wayne Donnell Thompson,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:08-cr-00309-REP-1)

Submitted: November 17, 2016 Decided: November 22, 2016

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and MOTZ and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Wayne D. Thompson, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Ronald Gill, Angela Mastandrea-Miller, Assistant United States Attorneys, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Wayne D. Thompson seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as successive his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. § 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 Thompson's informal appellate brief and conclude that Thompson 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

Appeal: 16-6862 Doc: 5 Filed: 11/22/2016 Pg: 3 of 3

presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED