

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-7584**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DEWAYNE ANTHONY SHIFFLETT,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Samuel G. Wilson, District Judge. (5:05-cr-00007-sgw; 7:06-cv-00497-sgw)

---

Submitted: March 18, 2008

Decided: April 8, 2008

---

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

DeWayne Anthony Shifflett, Appellant Pro Se. Ray Burton Fitzgerald, Jr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlottesville, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

DeWayne Anthony Shifflett 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 Shifflett has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Shifflett's motion for a certificate of appealability, deny his pro se motion for "Permission to file a writ of habeas corpus in the district court and consolidate briefs upon completion," 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