

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6495**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DONALD STANTON SHEALEY, a/k/a Face, a/k/a Diddy, a/k/a Face  
Diddy, a/k/a The City, a/k/a Donald Santon Shealey,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior  
District Judge. (5:08-cr-00282-F-2; 5:12-cv-00538-F)

---

Submitted: September 29, 2016

Decided: October 4, 2016

---

Before SHEDD, KEENAN, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Donald Stanton Shealey, Appellant Pro Se. Stephen Aubrey West,  
Assistant United States Attorney, Jonathan Philip Holbrook,  
Tobin Webb Lathan, Banumathi Rangarajan, Denise Walker, Seth  
Morgan Wood, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh,  
North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Donald Stanton Shealey seeks to appeal the district court's order construing his motion for a reduction in sentence as a successive and unauthorized 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and denying it on that basis. 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 Shealey 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