

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 18-6243**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KENNETH ROSHAUN REID,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (0:04-cr-00353-CMC-1)

---

Submitted: April 17, 2018

Decided: April 20, 2018

---

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

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kenneth Roshaun Reid, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Kenneth Roshaun Reid seeks to appeal from the district court's February 6, 2018, order denying his various motions, confining his appeal to the portion of the order construing his motions challenging one of his convictions and his sentence as successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motions and denying them. This portion of the district court's 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 Reid has not made the requisite showing. Reid's motions challenged the validity of one of his convictions and his sentence and were properly construed as successive § 2255 motions. See *Gonzalez v. Crosby*, 545 U.S. 524, 531-32 (2005); *United States v. Winestock*, 340 F.3d 200, 207 (4th Cir. 2003). In the absence of pre-filing authorization from this court, the district court lacked jurisdiction to hear successive § 2255 motions, see 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3) (2012), and thus should have dismissed Reid's motions.

Accordingly, we deny Reid'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*