

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-6895**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KENNETH D. BEVERLY,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District Judge. (3:05-cr-00526-HEH-1; 3:14-cv-00435-HEH)

---

Submitted: August 20, 2015

Decided: August 25, 2015

---

Before DUNCAN, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kenneth D. Beverly, Appellant Pro Se. Steven Thomas Buck, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia; Gregg Robert Nivala, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Gurney Wingate Grant, II, Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kenneth D. Beverly seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and his 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) (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 Beverly 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