

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-6419

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

PERRY REESE, III,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Wilmington. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (7:08-cr-00034-FL-1; 7:23-cv-00138-
FL)

Submitted: November 16, 2023

Decided: November 22, 2023

Before AGEE and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Perry Reese, III, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Perry Reese, III, seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion as successive and unauthorized. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). 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). When, as here, 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. *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Reese 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

* To the extent Reese seeks authorization from this court to file a successive § 2255 motion, we conclude that he fails to satisfy the criteria set forth in § 2255(h).