

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6126

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTHONY LANGUAN BRAME, a/k/a Ant,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:10-cr-00246-F-1; 5:12-cv-00611-F)

Submitted: May 30, 2013

Decided: June 5, 2013

Before SHEDD, DIAZ, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Languan Brame, Appellant Pro Se. Eric David Goulian, Shailika K. Shah, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Thomas B. Murphy, Rudolf A. Renfer, Jr., Assistant United States Attorneys, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Languan Brame 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 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.

In his informal brief, Brame has failed to address the district court's reasons for denying his motion. Therefore, Brame has forfeited appellate review of the district court's rulings. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny the pending motions to expand or amend the record, 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