

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6356**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WARSHAHENNEDIGE ANTON RAJ NISHANTHA FERNANDO,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:07-cr-00038-NCT-1; 1:10-cv-00192-NCT-JEP; 1:10-cv-00257-NCT-JEP)

---

Submitted: June 13, 2013

Decided: June 18, 2013

---

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Warshahennedige Anton Raj Nishantha Fernando, Appellant Pro Se. Michael A. DeFranco, Angela Hewlett Miller, Assistant United States Attorneys, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Warshahennedige Anton Raj Nishantha Fernando seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Fernando has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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