

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7599

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHARLES ELLIS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Parkersburg. Thomas E. Johnston, District Judge. (6:06-cr-00037-1; 6:10-cv-00041)

Submitted: February 26, 2013

Decided: February 28, 2013

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles Ellis, Appellant Pro Se. Steven Loew, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles Ellis seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) motion and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(b) and 59(e) motion. 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 Ellis 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED