

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-6537

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ANTHONY EDWARD ZELLNER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (CR-99-164-2)

Submitted: August 26, 2005

Decided: October 19, 2005

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Edward Zellner, Appellant Pro Se. Laura P. Tayman, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Edward Zellner seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion to reconsider judgment and his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to reconsider. An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). The denial of a post-judgment motion in a habeas proceeding is a final order that requires a certificate of appealability. See Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (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) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Zellner 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED