

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-6606

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JAMES M. DEBARDELEBEN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Deborah K. Chasanow, District Judge. (CR-84-43-WEB; CA-05-374-DKC)

Submitted: July 14, 2005

Decided: July 27, 2005

Before WILKINSON, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James M. DeBardleben, Appellant Pro Se. Tarra DeShields Minnis, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

James M. DeBardleben seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as successive his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). 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 both that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that DeBardleben 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