

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6823

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TIMOTHY MAURICE BLANTON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, Chief District Judge. (4:11-cr-02161-TLW-3)

Submitted: September 25, 2014 Decided: September 30, 2014

Before WILKINSON and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Timothy Maurice Blanton, Appellant Pro Se. Alfred William Walker Bethea, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Timothy Maurice Blanton seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his self-styled Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(d)(3) motion. Because Blanton's motion was a successive and unauthorized 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, see 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h); In re Vial, 115 F.3d 1192, 1194 (4th Cir. 1997), the district court was obligated to dismiss the motion, see United States v. Winestock, 340 F.3d 200, 205 (4th Cir. 2003), and the order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2012); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004).

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 Blanton 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