

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-7357**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

AL-LAIN DELONT NORMAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (2:08-cr-00034-RGD-FBS-1)

---

Submitted: January 2, 2013

Decided: January 10, 2013

---

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Al-Lain Delont Norman, Appellant Pro Se. Kevin Michael Comstock, Assistant United States Attorney, Damian J. Hansen, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Al-Lain Delont Norman seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2006). 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) (2006). 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 Norman has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Norman's motion to place this appeal in abeyance. 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