<u>**UNPUBLISHED**</u>

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————

No. 03-6666

———————

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

                            Plaintiff - Appellee,

    versus

VASU D. ARORA,

                          Defendant - Appellant.

———————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, Senior District Judge. (CR-98-72-1, CA-01-305-7)

———————

Submitted: September 30, 2003   Decided: October 7, 2003

———————

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

———————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————

Vasu D. Arora, Appellant Pro Se. Steven Randall Ramseyer, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Abingdon, Virginia, for Appellee.

———————

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Vasu D. Arora seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000). The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). 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) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, ___, 123 S. Ct. 1029, 1039 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Arora has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. Additionally, we deny Arora's petition for mandamus relief, and deny his motion for production of documents. 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