

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-6591**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

DOUGLAS MICHAEL VANVLEET,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. Frank W. Bullock, Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:03-cr-00222-FWB; 1:04-cv-01094-FWB)

---

Submitted: October 18, 2006

Decided: November 8, 2006

---

Before MICHAEL, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Douglas Michael Vanvleet, Appellant Pro Se. Angela Hewlett Miller, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Douglas Michael Vanvleet seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on 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 that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. 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 Vanvleet 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

---

\*Vanvleet has waived appellate review of two of his claims by failing to timely file specific objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation after receiving proper notice. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED