## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

		•
	No. 17-7165	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	۸,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
BRIAN LOUIS CLARK,		
Defendant - A	appellant.	
Appeal from the United States Dis William M. Nickerson, Senior Dis WMN)		•
Submitted: December 19, 2017		Decided: December 22, 2017
Before SHEDD, AGEE, and DIAZ	Z, Circuit Judges.	
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.	
Brian Louis Clark, Appellant Pro STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore		
Unpublished opinions are not bind	ing precedent in this	circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Brian Louis Clark seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his amended 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion as untimely filed. 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 Clark has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Clark's motion for 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**