

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-7278

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTHONY ANDREWS, a/k/a Wheat,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Wilmington. Terrence W. Boyle, Chief District Judge. (7:01-cr-00027-BO-1; 7:18-cv-
00053-BO)

Submitted: March 8, 2019

Decided: March 28, 2019

Before KING and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Andrews, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Andrews seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion as an unauthorized successive motion. 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 Andrews has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Andrews' motions for a stay pending appeal and to appoint counsel, 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