

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7310

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KIMBERLY RACHAEL MOORE, a/k/a Kimberly George, a/k/a
Havnfun,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Bryson City. Martin K.
Reidinger, District Judge. (2:12-cr-00030-MR-DLH-1; 1:15-cv-
00295-MR)

Submitted: February 16, 2017 Decided: February 21, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, DUNCAN, Circuit Judge, and
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kimberly Rachael Moore, Appellant Pro Se. Courtney Randall,
Assistant United States Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina;
David A. Thorneloe, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,
Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kimberly Rachael Moore seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely 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 Moore has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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