

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6824

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

FURMAN BENJAMIN QUATTLEBAUM,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (3:02-cr-00548-CMC-17; 3:17-cv-01533-CMC)

Submitted: September 28, 2017

Decided: October 3, 2017

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Furman Benjamin Quattlebaum, Appellant Pro Se. Beth Drake, Acting United States Attorney, John C. Potterfield, Jane Barrett Taylor, Assistant United States Attorneys, Columbia, South Carolina, Carrie Fisher Sherard, Leesa Washington, Assistant United States Attorneys, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Furman Benjamin Quattlebaum seeks to appeal the district court's order construing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion as successive and unauthorized and dismissing it on that basis. 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 Quattlebaum 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