US v. Cobey Webb Appeal: 17-6075 Doc: 5 Filed: 05/17/2017 Pg: 1 of 2

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEAL	S
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT	

No. 17-6075
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff - Appellee,
v.
COBEY DARON WEBB,
Defendant - Appellant.
Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Glen E. Conrad, Chief District Judge. (7:05-cr-00102-GEC-RSB-1; 7:16-cv-81213-GEC-RSB)
Submitted: May 16, 2017 Decided: May 17, 2017
Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.
Cobey Daron Webb, Appellant Pro Se. Donald Ray Wolthuis, Assistant United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellee.
Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 406528384

PER CURIAM:

Cobey Daron Webb seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion without prejudice as successive. 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 Webb 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 contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED