

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

No. 17-15270-E

BRADLEY SCOTT ADKINS,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent-Appellee.

**Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Florida**

Before WILSON and ROSENBAUM, Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

Bradley Adkins has filed a motion for reconsideration of this Court's order dated April 16, 2018, denying his motion for a certificate of appealability and leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in his appeal of the district court's denial of his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion to vacate his sentence. Upon review, Adkins's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED** because he has offered no new evidence or arguments of merit to warrant relief.

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-15270-E

BRADLEY SCOTT ADKINS,

Petitioner-Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Florida

ORDER:

Bradley Adkins moves for a certificate of appealability ("COA") and leave to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), in order to appeal the denial of his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion to vacate sentence. In order to obtain a COA, a movant must make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The movant satisfies this requirement by demonstrating that "reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or that the issues "deserve encouragement to proceed further." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (quotation omitted). Because Adkins has failed to make the requisite showing, his motion for a COA is DENIED. His motion for leave to proceed IFP is DENIED AS MOOT.

/s/ Charles R. Wilson
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE