US v. Damon Elliott

Appeal: 16-7544 Doc: 10 Filed: 02/03/2017 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7544

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAMON EMANUEL ELLIOTT,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Peter J. Messitte, Senior District Judge. (8:97-cr-00053-PJM-1; 8:16-cv-03419-PJM)

Submitted: January 31, 2017 Decided: February 3, 2017

Before WILKINSON, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Damon Emanuel Elliott, Appellant Pro Se. Lindsay Eyler Kaplan, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 406384375

PER CURIAM:

Damon Emanuel Elliott seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion successive and unauthorized. The order is not appealable unless justice or judge issues a certificate 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. <u>Cockrell</u>, 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 Elliott 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: 16-7544 Doc: 10 Filed: 02/03/2017 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED