UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

<u>-</u>	No. 18-6061	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	,	
Plaintiff - App	ellee,	
v.		
MICHAEL GREENE, a/k/a Mike,		
Defendant - A	ppellant.	
Appeal from the United States Dist. Charlotte. Frank D. Whitney, Ch. 00420-FDW)		
Submitted: June 21, 2018		Decided: July 20, 2018
Before KEENAN and THACKER,	Circuit Judges, and F	IAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Michael Greene, Appellant Pro Se.		
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ng precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Greene 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 Greene has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Greene's motion for appointment of counsel, 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