

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-7765**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

REGINALD ANTHONY FALICE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Graham C. Mullen, Senior District Judge. (3:98-cr-00244-GCM-1; 3:14-cv-00640-GCM)

---

Submitted: April 16, 2015

Decided: April 20, 2015

---

Before AGEE and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Reginald Anthony Falice, Appellant Pro Se. Sidney P. Alexander, Assistant United States Attorney, Paul Brad Taylor, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Asheville, North Carolina; Gretchen C. F. Shappert, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for the Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Reginald Anthony Falice seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as successive his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. The order is 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 Falice has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny permission to proceed in forma pauperis, 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