UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•		
	No. 19-6625	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	.,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
THOMAS MARSHALL BYRD,		
Defendant - A	ppellant.	
Appeal from the United States Dist Greensboro. William L. Osteen, 01028-WO-LPA)		
Submitted: November 19, 2019		Decided: December 4, 2019
Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a	and NIEMEYER and	MOTZ, Circuit Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curis	am opinion.	
Thomas Marshall Byrd, Appellant	Pro Se.	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ing precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Thomas Marshall Byrd seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Byrd's 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.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Byrd has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Byrd's motion for 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