

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 20-6919**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MARCUS FREEMAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, District Judge. (3:16-cr-00021-MHL-1; 3:17-cv-00661-MHL)

---

Submitted: December 22, 2020

Decided: December 29, 2020

---

Before NIEMEYER, FLOYD, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Marcus Freeman, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Marcus Freeman 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 Freeman has not made the requisite showing. *See United States v. Ward*, 972 F.3d 364, 371 (4th Cir. 2020). Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. In addition, to the extent that Freeman intended attachments to his informal brief to serve as motions to this court requesting transcripts at Government expense, we deny his requests. 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*