

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6567**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHRISTOPHER RYAN HAYES,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, District Judge. (3:08-cr-00855-CMC-1; 3:11-cv-03223-CMC)

---

Submitted: July 25, 2013

Decided: July 30, 2013

---

Before GREGORY, DAVIS, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Christopher Ryan Hayes, Appellant Pro Se. Winston David Holliday, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Ryan Hayes seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013) motion and its subsequent order denying his motions filed pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 15 and 59(e). 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 Hayes has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Hayes' motion for a certificate of appealability, deny his request for prefiling of motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h)(1),

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