

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 20-7074**

---

JAMES MAURICE WILSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ERIK A. HOOKS,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Martin K. Reidinger, Chief District Judge. (5:19-cv-00108-MR)

---

Submitted: November 17, 2020

Decided: November 20, 2020

---

Before MOTZ and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James Maurice Wilson, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James Maurice Wilson seeks to appeal the district court's order granting Respondent's motion for summary judgment and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A). 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 petition 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)).

Limiting our review of the record to the issues raised in Wilson's informal brief and supplemental informal brief, we conclude that Wilson 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) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We also deny Wilson's motion for injunctive relief.

---

\* To the extent that Wilson's informal brief and supplemental informal brief raise claims that he did not allege in his § 2254 petition, we decline to consider those claims. *See Berkeley Cnty. Sch. Dist. v. Hub Int'l Ltd.*, 944 F.3d 225, 235 (4th Cir. 2019).

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*