

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6432

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

GLENN CARSON MOORE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:98-cr-00068-BO-1; 5:24-cv-00464-BO)

Submitted: July 8, 2025

Decided: July 18, 2025

Before GREGORY, AGEE, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Glenn Carson Moore, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Glenn Carson Moore seeks to appeal the district court's April 7, 2025, order granting the Government's motion to dismiss and dismissing Moore's 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 Moore has not made the requisite showing. We note, however, that on June 11, 2025—after the district court dismissed the underlying unauthorized § 2255 motion—we granted Moore's 28 U.S.C. § 2244 motion for authorization to file a successive § 2255 motion. *See In re Moore*, No. 25-149 (4th Cir. June 11, 2025) (unpublished order). Accordingly, although we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the instant appeal, Moore now has the necessary authorization under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2244, 2255(h), to pursue his claim in the district court.

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