

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7641

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DELFFON LEBREW HARE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, Senior District Judge. (8:07-cr-00189-RWT-1; 8:10-cv-01757-RWT)

Submitted: February 20, 2014

Decided: February 26, 2014

Before DUNCAN, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Delfon Lebrew Hare, Appellant Pro Se. Adam Kenneth Ake, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Deborah A. Johnston, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Delfon Lebrew Hare seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (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) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 Hare has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Hare's motions to place the case in abeyance and to "reformulate" his informal brief after the district court rules on a Rule 60(b) motion, or in the alternative to receive an

extension to correct and clarify his brief. 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