

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6875

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHARLES JERMAINE KEITT,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Margaret B. Seymour, Chief District Judge. (5:07-cr-01020-MBS-1; 5:09-cv-70092-MBS)

Submitted: February 16, 2012

Decided: February 21, 2012

Before SHEDD, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles Jermaine Keitt, Appellant Pro Se. Stanley Duane Ragsdale, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles Jermaine Keitt seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2011) motion and denying his subsequent Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motions for reconsideration. These orders are 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 Keitt 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