

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-7199**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTHONY DANIEL SMITH, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at  
Wilmington. W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge. (7:07-cr-00101-BR-1; 7:17-cv-00141-  
BR)

---

Submitted: January 30, 2018

Decided: February 2, 2018

---

Before MOTZ and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Anthony Daniel Smith, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Edward D. Gray, Jennifer P. May-Parker,  
Rudy E. Renfer, Assistant United States Attorneys, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES  
ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Daniel Smith, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on 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 Smith 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*