

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 18-6789**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MICHAEL ANGELO LOISEAU, a/k/a Malik, a/k/a Michael Wright,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 18-7309**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MICHAEL ANGELO LOISEAU, a/k/a Malik, a/k/a Michael Wright,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:97-cr-00344-REP-1; 3:16-cv-00866-REP)

---

Submitted: December 18, 2018

Decided: December 21, 2018

---

Before AGEE, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Angelo Loiseau, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Michael Angelo Loiseau seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, which related to the judgment imposed upon the revocation of Loiseau's federal supervised release, and the court's subsequent order denying Loiseau's Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend judgment. 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 Loiseau has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeals. 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*