

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-7518

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

DWAYNE MANNING, a/k/a Rude Dog, a/k/a Jonathan
Manning,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Malcolm J. Howard, District
Judge. (CR-95-156-H, CA-02-356-5-H)

Submitted: January 16, 2003

Decided: January 24, 2003

Before WILLIAMS, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dwayne Manning, Appellant Pro Se. John Howarth Bennett, OFFICE OF
THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Dwayne Manning, a federal prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion. An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). When, as here, a district court dismisses a § 2255 motion solely on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability will not issue unless the movant can demonstrate both "(1) that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right' and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.'" Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 684 (4th Cir.) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)), cert. denied, 122 S. Ct. 318 (2001). We have reviewed the record and conclude for the reasons stated by the district court that Manning has not made the requisite showing. See United States v. Manning, Nos. CR-95-156-H; CA-02-356-5-H (E.D.N.C. Aug. 21, 2002; filed Sept. 27, 2002 & entered Sept. 30, 2002). 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED