

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6483**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DEWAYNE ROY WILSON, a/k/a Dub, a/k/a New Jersey, a/k/a  
Jonah James Levant, III,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of Virginia, at Charlottesville. Glen E. Conrad, Chief  
District Judge. (3:12-cr-00035-GEC-RSB-1; 3:15-cv-80812-GEC-  
RSB)

---

Submitted: September 20, 2016                      Decided: September 29, 2016

---

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Dewayne Roy Wilson, Appellant Pro Se. Ronald Mitchell Huber,  
Assistant United States Attorney, Charlottesville, Virginia, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dewayne Roy Wilson seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing 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 Wilson 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