UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| - | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| _ | No. 18-7100 | | |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | ., | | |
| Plaintiff - App | pellee, | | |
| v. | | | |
| SHAWNTAY LAKEITH SWANN | N, | | |
| Defendant - A | ppellant. | | |
| Appeal from the United States Dist Greensboro. Thomas D. Schrod 1:18-cv-00527-TDS-JLW) | | | |
| Submitted: March 28, 2019 | | | Decided: April 11, 2019 |
| Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a | and KING and AGEE | E, Circuit . | Judges. |
| Dismissed by unpublished per curia | am opinion. | | |
| Shawntay Lakeith Swann, Appella | nt Pro Se. | | |
| Unpublished opinions are not bindi | ing precedent in this | circuit. | |

PER CURIAM:

Shawntay Lakeith Swann seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion as successive. 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 Swann 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