

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6974

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DEVARES ANTRON VICK, a/k/a Red,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever, III, Chief District Judge. (5:06-cr-00235-D-1; 5:11-cv-00508-D)

Submitted: January 22, 2015

Decided: January 26, 2015

Before SHEDD, KEENAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Devares Antron Vick, Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer P. May-Parker, Assistant United States Attorney, Kimberly Ann Moore, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Devares Antron Vick seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and denying reconsideration. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 Vick has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Vick's motions to place the case in abeyance and appoint counsel. 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