Appeal: 16-7396 Doc: 7 Filed: 11/30/2016 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7396

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTHONY LEE WAINWRIGHT, JR., a/k/a Youngin,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Rebecca Beach Smith, Chief District Judge. (4:10-cr-00016-RBS-TEM-1; 4:16-cv-00113-RBS)

Submitted: November 17, 2016 Decided: November 30, 2016

Before NIEMEYER, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Lee Wainwright, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Lisa Rae McKeel, Brian James Samuels, Howard Jacob Zlotnick, Assistant United States Attorneys, Newport News, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Lee Wainwright, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order denying 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. See 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 Wainwright 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

Appeal: 16-7396 Doc: 7 Filed: 11/30/2016 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED