

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-7121**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TIMOTHY JONES, a/k/a Dog, a/k/a Digits, a/k/a Digits  
Chemist,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever III,  
District Judge. (5:04-cr-00324-D-1; 5:08-cv-00582-D)

---

Submitted: February 28, 2011

Decided: March 15, 2011

---

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Timothy Jones, Appellant Pro Se. Matthew Fesak, Rudolf A.  
Renfer, Jr., Assistant United States Attorneys, Michael Gordon  
James, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North  
Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Timothy Jones seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). 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) (2006). 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 Jones 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED