

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6574

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTONIO THOMPSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Catherine C. Blake, Chief District Judge. (1:09-cr-00128-CCB-1; 1:17-cv-00750-CCB)

Submitted: September 26, 2017

Decided: September 28, 2017

Before NIEMEYER and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Antonio Thompson, Appellant Pro Se. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney,
Tamera Lynn Fine, Robert Reeves Harding, Assistant United States Attorneys, Christine
Marie Celeste, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland,
for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Antonio Thompson seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as successive 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 Thompson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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