

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-6002

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHRISTOPHER CIAMPA,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:14-cr-00197-FL-1; 5:16-cv-00850-FL)

Submitted: June 7, 2019

Decided: July 3, 2019

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and WYNN and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas Reston Wilson, GREENE & WILSON, PA, New Bern, North Carolina, for Appellant.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Ciampa seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Ciampa's 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) 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 Ciampa 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