US v. Javis McKenzie Appeal: 12-6928 Doc: 6 Filed: 08/27/2012 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 404052657

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6928

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JAVIS SHERARD MCKENZIE, a/k/a Jay Rock, a/k/a Jarvis McKenzie,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (3:07-cr-00155-JFA-3; 3:11-cv-03143-JFA)

Submitted: August 22, 2012 Decided: August 27, 2012

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Javis Sherard McKenzie, Appellant Pro Se. Stacey Denise Haynes, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Javis Sherard McKenzie seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2006). A certificate 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 would find that the reasonable jurists district court's the constitutional claims is debatable or assessment of 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 McKenzie 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 Appeal: 12-6928 Doc: 6 Filed: 08/27/2012 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED