US v. Shamsadeen Purvis

Doc. 0

Case: 08-6867 Document: 16 Date Filed: 07/14/2010 Page: 1

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-6867

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SHAMSADEEN IBN PURVIS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge. (8:04-cr-00495-AW-1; 8:08-cv-00170-AW)

Submitted: June 29, 2010 Decided: July 14, 2010

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and KING and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Shamsadeen Ibn Purvis, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Richard Pauze, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Case: 08-6867 Document: 16 Date Filed: 07/14/2010 Page: 2

PER CURIAM:

Shamsadeen Ibn Purvis seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). 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) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). 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. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Purvis 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

Case: 08-6867 Document: 16 Date Filed: 07/14/2010 Page: 3

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED