

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 01-6093**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

DERRICK HUGH DEHANEY,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, District Judge. (CR-96-49, CA-99-343)

---

Submitted: April 27, 2001

Decided: May 4, 2001

---

Before LUTTIG and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Derrick Hugh Dehaney, Appellant Pro Se. Joseph William Hooge Mott, Assistant United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Derrick Hugh Dehaney seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2000). We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal on the reasoning of the district court.\* United States v. Dehaney, Nos. CR-96-49; CA-99-343 (W.D. Va. Dec. 6, 2000). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

---

\* Dehaney also raises on appeal an equal protection claim that he did not assert in the district court. This court will not address issues raised for the first time on appeal except in exceptional circumstances not present here. Grossman v. Commissioner, 182 F.3d 275, 280-81 (4th Cir. 1999).