

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 20-6820**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DEVON DALE BECKFORD, a/k/a Chubbs, a/k/a Trubbey, a/k/a Bull, a/k/a Big  
Bull, a/k/a Fats,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at  
Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:96-cr-00066-REP-2; 3:99-cv-  
00512-REP)

---

Submitted: October 20, 2020

Decided: October 23, 2020

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, DIAZ, Circuit Judge, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Devon Dale Beckford, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Devon Dale Beckford seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for relief from the district court's prior order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion and denying his motion to alter or amend that order. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). *See generally United States v. McRae*, 793 F.3d 392, 400 & n.7 (4th Cir. 2015). 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 Beckford has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Beckford's motion for appointment of counsel, 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*