

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-6030**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

NICO-LACHAD RICKENAN MONROE,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, District Judge. (1:13-cr-00252-CCE-1; 1:15-cv-01083-CCE-JLW)

---

Submitted: May 23, 2017

Decided: May 26, 2017

---

Before KING, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Nico-Lachad Rickenan Monroe, Appellant Pro Se. Michael A. DeFranco, Robert Michael Hamilton, Michael Francis Joseph, Angela Hewlett Miller, Assistant United States Attorneys, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nico-Lachad Rickenan Monroe seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation to grant the Government's motion to dismiss his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (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) (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.

Based on the arguments presented in his informal brief, we conclude that Monroe has not made the requisite showing. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *see also Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) (noting the importance of Rule 34(b) and reiterating that the court limits its review to the issues preserved in the informal brief). 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*