UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

		i	
<u>-</u>	No. 17-7454		
EVERTON BARTLEY, a/k/a Fred	erick Alexander Ma	rtin, a/k/a	John,
Plaintiff - App	ellant,		
v.			
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	,		
Defendant - A	ppellee.		
Appeal from the United States Dis at Charlotte. Frank D. Whitned 3:17-cv-00235-FDW)			
Submitted: April 25, 2018			Decided: May 2, 2018
Before DUNCAN and WYNN, Cir	cuit Judges, and SH	EDD, Sen	ior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.		
Everton Bartley, Appellant Pro Se.			
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ing precedent in this	circuit.	

PER CURIAM:

Everton Bartley 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 Bartley 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