## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•		
_	No. 18-6737	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	.,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
WILLIAM A. WHITE,		
Defendant - A	ppellant.	
Appeal from the United States D Roanoke. Glen E. Conrad, Distric RSB)		•
Submitted: September 13, 2018		Decided: September 18, 2018
Before NIEMEYER and KING, Ci	rcuit Judges, and HA	AMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
William A. White, Appellant Pro S	e.	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ing precedent in this	circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

William A. White seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion as successive and denying reconsideration. The orders are 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 White 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