

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-6633

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

MICHAEL DEVON POWELL, a/k/a Petey,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Wilmington. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (7:99-cr-00024-3F; 7:04-cv-00077-F)

Submitted: August 31, 2006

Decided: September 7, 2006

Before MICHAEL, MOTZ, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Devon Powell, Appellant Pro Se. Steve R. Matheny, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Michael Devon Powell seeks to appeal the district court's order 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 Powell has not made the requisite showing. In addition, the court limits its review to the issues raised in Appellant's informal brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). This court generally does not consider issues raised for the first time on appeal. See Muth v. United States, 1 F.3d 246, 250 (4th Cir. 1993) (noting that issues raised for the first time on appeal are generally not considered absent exceptional circumstances). 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