

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 06-8067

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ANTHONY FEURTADO, a/k/a Anthony Greene, a/k/a  
Ginzo, a/k/a Gap, a/k/a Pretty Tony, a/k/a  
Tony Feurtado, a/k/a Anthony Lamar Brown,  
a/k/a Anthony Paul,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Columbia. Sol Blatt, Jr., Senior District  
Judge. (3:96-cr-00325; 3:03-cv-02949-SB)

---

Submitted: June 13, 2007

Decided: July 10, 2007

---

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

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Anthony Feurtado, Appellant Pro Se. Mark C. Moore, Assistant  
United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Feurtado seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion and denying his 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 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 Feurtado has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny the motion to reconsider the order denying leave to file a pro se supplemental brief. 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