

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-7009

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

CHRISTOPHER ANDARYL WILLS, a/k/a Michael
Wills, a/k/a Ed Short,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District
Judge. (1:99-cr-00396-LMB; 1:05-cv-00775-LMB)

Submitted: March 28, 2007

Decided: April 20, 2007

Before NIEMEYER and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher Andaryl Wills, Appellant Pro Se. James L. Trump, OFFICE
OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Kevin Victor DiGregory, Assistant
United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Andaryl Wills seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion and subsequent Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion for reconsideration. The orders are 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 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 Wills has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Wills' motions for appointment of counsel, deny his motion for 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