

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-7595**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BERNARD GIBSON, SR., a/k/a Bernard Willis,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Peter J. Messitte, Senior District Judge. (8:94-cr-00454-PJM-2; 8:13-cv-01825-PJM)

---

Submitted: December 17, 2013

Decided: December 20, 2013

---

Before KING, GREGORY, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Bernard Gibson, Sr., Appellant Pro Se. Stuart A. Berman, Chan Park, Assistant United States Attorneys, Greenbelt, Maryland, Sandra Wilkinson, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Bernard Gibson, Sr., seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his "Motion for Relief in the Interest of Justice Under Section 2255(f)(3) of Title 28 (second-in-time)" as a successive and unauthorized habeas motion, and denying his subsequent Fed. R. Civ. P. 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 Gibson 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