

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-6783**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CARLOS WOODS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William D. Quarles, Jr., District Judge. (1:07-cr-00127-WDQ-1; 1:10-cv-01321-WDQ)

---

Submitted: September 13, 2011                      Decided: September 16, 2011

---

Before AGEE, DAVIS, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Carlos Woods, Appellant Pro Se. John Walter Sippel, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Jason M. Weinstein, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Carlos Woods seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion\* for reconsideration of the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2011) motion. 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). 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

---

\* Because Woods' motion sought a remedy for a perceived flaw in the collateral review process, the motion was not a second or successive § 2255 motion. See Gonzalez v. Crosby, 545 U.S. 524, 530-32 & n.4 (2005); United States v. Winestock, 340 F.3d 200, 206-08 (4th Cir. 2003).

conclude that Woods 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