Doc: 13 Filed: 09/04/2013 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6611

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KALONJI SKOU EWING, a/k/a Luck,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:09-cr-00151-FL-1; 5:12-cv-00369-FL)

Submitted: August 26, 2013 Decided: September 4, 2013

Before MOTZ, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kalonji Skou Ewing, Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer P. May-Parker, Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 404611452

PER CURIAM:

Kalonji Skou Ewing seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013) 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 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 Ewing has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny the motion for appointment of counsel and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

Appeal: 13-6611 Doc: 13 Filed: 09/04/2013 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED