

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7312

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RONALD JUNIOR SADM, a/k/a Ronald Junior Bossadm,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Harrisonburg. Michael F. Urbanski, District Judge. (5:08-cr-00021-MFU-RSB-1; 5:15-cv-80849-MFU-RSB)

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Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronald Junior Sadm, Appellant Pro Se. Jean Barrett Hudson, Assistant United States Attorney, Charlottesville, Virginia, Jeb Thomas Terrien, Assistant United States Attorney, Harrisonburg, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronald Junior Sadm 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 Sadm has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Sadm's motion for 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