

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 18-6551**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RONNIE D. RAINY,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever III, Chief District Judge. (5:10-cr-00199-D-1; 5:12-cv-00778-D)

---

Submitted: October 10, 2018

Decided: October 16, 2018

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, THACKER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Ronnie D. Rainey, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronnie D. Rainey seeks to appeal the district court's order construing three miscellaneous motions as 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motions and dismissing them as successive and unauthorized. 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, although the district court's dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, *see Magwood v. Patterson*, 561 U.S. 320 (2010), Rainey has not raised a debatable constitutional claim, *see Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484-85. 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*