

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-6911**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ARNOLD LLOYD JACKSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Harrisonburg. Samuel G. Wilson, District Judge. (5:02-cr-30020-sgw-mfu-13; 5:07-cv-80014-sgw-mfu)

---

Submitted: March 30, 2010

Decided: April 2, 2010

---

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Arnold Lloyd Jackson, Appellant Pro Se. Jean Barrett Hudson, Assistant United States Attorney, Charlottesville, Virginia; Ryan Lee Souders, Jeb Thomas Terrien, Assistant United States Attorneys, Harrisonburg, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Arnold Lloyd Jackson seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). 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) (2006). 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 Jackson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Jackson's motions for appointment of counsel. 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