

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-6772**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DEAN CURTIS SAWYER,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, Chief District Judge. (2:07-cr-00125-RBS-TEM-5; 2:09-cv-00634-RBS)

---

Submitted: July 19, 2012

Decided: July 26, 2012

---

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Dean Curtis Sawyer, Appellant Pro Se. Laura Pellatiro Tayman, Assistant United States Attorney, Newport News, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dean Curtis Sawyer seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his "Motion to Supplement, Amend and Relate Back to Original 28 USC § 2255 Motion Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 15(c)." 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 Sawyer 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