

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7897

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JAMERSON DEVOIR TILLMAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 14-7902

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JAMES TILLMAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District Judge. (8:00-cr-00137-DKC-1; 8:14-cv-03314-DKC; 8:00-cr-00137-DKC-2; 8:14-cv-03315-DKC)

Submitted: April 16, 2015

Decided: April 21, 2015

Before AGEE and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jamerson Devoir Tillman and James Tillman, Appellants Pro Se.
Michael Thomas Packard, Assistant United States Attorney,
Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jamerson Devoir Tillman and James Tillman seek to appeal from the district court's orders dismissing their 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motions as successive. 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 records and conclude that the Tillmans have not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates of appealability and dismiss the appeals. 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