

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-6919**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAMON EMANUEL ELLIOTT,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Peter J. Messitte, Senior District Judge. (8:97-cr-00053-PJM-1)

---

Submitted: August 16, 2012

Decided: August 21, 2012

---

Before KING and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Damon Emanuel Elliott, Appellant Pro Se. Stuart A. Berman, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Damon Emanuel Elliott, a federal prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's paperless order denying his motions for a certificate of appealability in his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) proceedings. 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 Elliott has not made the requisite showing. It is apparent from the record that Elliott's motions for a certificate of appealability were, in reality, an attempt to file a successive 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 motion. 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