

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6520

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

REGGIE DELOACH, a/k/a Intell Abrams,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:98-cr-00323-REP-1; 3:11-cv-00184-REP)

Submitted: August 25, 2011

Decided: August 30, 2011

Before MOTZ, DUNCAN, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Reggie DeLoach, Appellant Pro Se. Lisa Rae McKeel, Assistant United States Attorney, Newport News, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Reggie DeLoach seeks to appeal the district court's order construing his motion for immediate release from custody as an unauthorized successive 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2011) motion and dismissing it on that basis. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (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 DeLoach 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