

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-6948

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

EDWARD DANE JEFFUS,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 18-7000

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

EDWARD DANE JEFFUS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina,
at Greensboro. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Senior District Judge. (6:92-cr-00184-NCT-2;
1:16-cv-00085-NCT-JEP; 1:16-cv-01276-NCT-JEP)

Submitted: December 18, 2018

Decided: December 26, 2018

Before NIEMEYER and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Edward Dane Jeffus, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Edward Dane Jeffus seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendations of the magistrate judge and dismissing his "Motion for Indicative Ruling" and "Motion for Modification and/or Clarification of Sentence" as unauthorized and successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motions. 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 records and conclude that Jeffus has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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