

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7426

NABIL AISSI,
Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

JEFFREY CRAWFORD, Warden, Farmville Immigration Detention Center; JOHN MORTON, Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; THOMAS HOMAN, Executive Associate Director, Enforcement and Removal Operations, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; MATTHEW MUNROE, Director, Washington Field Office, Enforcement and Removal Operations, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; ERIC H. HOLDER, U.S. Attorney General; JANET NAPOLITANO, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. James R. Spencer, District Judge. (3:13-cv-00425-JRS)

Submitted: November 19, 2013

Decided: November 22, 2013

Before WYNN and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Randall L. Johnson, JOHNSON & ASSOCIATES, PC, Arlington, Virginia, for Appellant.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nabil Aissi seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing for lack of jurisdiction his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) 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 Aissi 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