UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6015

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ROBERT EBEY TAYLOR,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Elizabeth City. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (2:13-cr-00024-F-1; 2:16-cv-00041-F)

Submitted: August 24, 2017 Decided: August 28, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and SHEDD and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Robert Ebey Taylor, Appellant Pro Se. Ethan A. Ontjes, Donald Russell Pender, Assistant United States Attorneys, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

PER CURIAM:

Robert Ebey Taylor seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on 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 Taylor has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, although we grant Taylor's motion to amend page three of his informal brief, we deny 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