UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| • | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| | No. 24-6215 | |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | ·, | |
| Plaintiff - App | pellee, | |
| v. | | |
| KENNETH ROSHAUN REID, | | |
| Defendant - A | appellant. | |
| | | |
| Appeal from the United States Dis Hill. Cameron McGowan Currie, S | | |
| Submitted: April 18, 2024 | | Decided: April 22, 2024 |
| Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER | R, and THACKER, C | Circuit Judges. |
| Dismissed by unpublished per curi | am opinion. | |
| Kenneth Roshaun Reid, Appellar United States Attorney, OFFICE of South Carolina, for Appellee. | | |
| Unpublished opinions are not bind | ing precedent in this | circuit. |

PER CURIAM:

Kenneth Roshaun Reid seeks to appeal the district court's order construing his motion under "2255(f)(3)" as a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion and dismissing it as successive and unauthorized. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). 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). When, as here, 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. *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Reid has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Reid's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Reid's motion to appoint counsel and 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