US v. Damon Elliott Appeal: 17-6430 Doc: 9

Doc: 9 Filed: 05/26/2017 Pg: 1 of 2

Doc. 406541450

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6	430
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
Plaintiff - Appellee,	
v.	
DAMON EMANUEL ELLIOTT,	
Defendant - Appellant.	
Appeal from the United States District Court f Peter J. Messitte, Senior District Judge. (8:97-c	
Submitted: May 23, 2017	Decided: May 26, 2017
Before KING, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judg	ges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.	
Damon Emanuel Elliott, Appellant Pro Se. Line Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.	dsay Eyler Kaplan, Assistant United States
Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent	t in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

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

DISMISSED