

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6503

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

REGINALD MIMMS, a/k/a Gerald King,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, Senior District Judge. (7:00-cr-00022-JCT-RSB-1; 7:12-cv-80398-JCT-RSB; 7:12-cv-80411-JCT-RSB)

Submitted: July 26, 2012

Decided: August 2, 2012

Before MOTZ, DAVIS, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Reginald Mimms, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Reginald Mimms seeks to appeal the district court's orders construing his motions for a writ of audita querela as 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) motions, and denying them for failure to first obtain authorization from this court to file a successive § 2255 motion. See 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 2244(b)(2), 2255 (West 2000 & Supp. 2012). The 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 Mimms 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