

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6561**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOHNNIE BUTLER, a/k/a JR,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. David A. Faber, Senior District Judge. (1:08-cr-00381-DAF-1; 1:12-cv-03468-DAF)

---

Submitted: October 17, 2016

Decided: October 28, 2016

---

Before SHEDD, KEENAN, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Johnnie Butler, Appellant Pro Se. Christine Marie Celeste, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Joshua Thomas Ferrentino, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Johnnie Butler seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). 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 Butler 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