## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

-		
<u>-</u>	No. 20-6528	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
STACY ARTHANIEL THREATT		
Defendant - A	ppellant.	
Appeal from the United States Dist Charlotte. Frank D. Whitney, Dist FDW)		
Submitted: November 13, 2020		Decided: November 18, 2020
Before KING and HARRIS, Circui	t Judges, and TRAX	LER, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Stacy Arthaniel Threatt, Appellant	Pro Se.	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ing precedent in this	circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Stacy Arthaniel Threatt seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). 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). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists could find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. *See Buck v. Davis*, 137 S. Ct. 759, 773-74 (2017). 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. *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Threatt has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Threatt's motion to appoint/assign counsel, 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**