

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7732

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTONE HENRY POINDEXTER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (3:97-cr-00079-JCC-1; 3:15-cv-00375-REP)

Submitted: April 19, 2016

Decided: April 21, 2016

Before AGEE, DIAZ, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Antone Henry Poindexter, Appellant Pro Se. Stephen Wiley Miller, Stephen David Schiller, Assistant United States Attorneys, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Antone Henry Poindexter seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion as successive and denying his motion to reconsider. 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 Poindexter 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