

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6154

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DANIEL WATLINGTON, a/k/a Gator Slim,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:05-cr-00004-F-1; 5:10-cv-00031-F)

Submitted: April 28, 2011

Decided: May 4, 2011

Before DAVIS, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Daniel Watlington, Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer P. May-Parker, Assistant United States Attorney, Seth Morgan Wood, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Daniel Watlington seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion and denying his motion to amend. 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). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Watlington has not made the requisite showing. 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