

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-6271**

---

NATHANIEL CALDWELL, III,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN ROBERTO ROBERTS,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Aiken.  
Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (1:14-cv-04277-RMG)

---

Submitted: March 20, 2018

Decided: April 25, 2018

---

Before KING, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Nathaniel Caldwell, III, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Nathaniel Caldwell, III, seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation in part, denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, and denying his motion for reconsideration. The orders are 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 Caldwell has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny the pending motion as moot, 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*