UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-6063

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BROOKS JAMES TERRELL,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Spartanburg. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (7:99-cr-00610-HMH-1; 7:18-cv-03384-HMH)

Submitted: April 16, 2019

Decided: April 29, 2019

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

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Brooks James Terrell, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Brooks James Terrell seeks to appeal the district court's order 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); *Jones v. Braxton*, 392 F.3d 683, 688 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 Terrell has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny the pending motion, 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

2