

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-6793**

---

GARY BUTERRA WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DAVID L. SIMONS, Superintendent,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District Judge. (3:10-cv-00599-HEH)

---

Submitted: August 18, 2011

Decided: August 23, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON, DAVIS, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Gary Buterra Williams, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gary Buterra Williams, a state pre-trial detainee, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2241 (West 2006 & Supp. 2011) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (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 petition 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 Williams has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We also deny Williams' motions to stay the state criminal proceedings pending appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED