

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-7336**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JIMMY LAWRENCE NANCE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James P. Jones, District Judge. (7:92-cr-00135-JPJ-RSB-1; 7:14-cv-00353; 7:14-cv-80760-JPJ-RSB)

---

Submitted: January 22, 2015

Decided: January 27, 2015

---

Before SHEDD, KEENAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jimmy Lawrence Nance, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Linn Eckert, Assistant United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jimmy Lawrence Nance seeks to appeal the district court's orders treating his "Petition and Motion for a Writ of Coram Nobis and/or Audita Querela" as a successive and unauthorized 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, and dismissing it on that basis, and denying Nance's motion for reconsideration. The district court's orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2012); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 Nance 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