

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-7265**

---

KEITH D. WILSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

SUPERINTENDENT DON WOOD; SECRETARY OF CORRECTIONS THEODIS  
BECK,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. William L. Osteen,  
Jr., District Judge. (1:06-cv-00408-WO-WWD)

---

Submitted: February 9, 2012

Decided: February 14, 2012

---

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Keith D. Wilson, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III,  
Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Keith D. Wilson seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2006); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 Wilson 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