UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

-	No. 22-7186	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	,	
Plaintiff - App	ellee,	
v.		
PHIL CAPRICE HOWARD,		
Defendant - A _l	ppellant.	
<u>-</u>	_	
Appeal from the United States Dist. Greenville. James C. Dever III, Dis		
Submitted: October 19, 2023		Decided: October 23, 2023
Before KING and WYNN, Circuit	Judges, and TRAXL	ER, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Phil Caprice Howard, Appellant Pro-	o Se.	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ng precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Phil Caprice Howard seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion and denying reconsideration. The orders are 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*, 580 U.S. 100, 115-17 (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 Howard has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we 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