US v. Robert Murray
Appeal: 13-7718 Doc: 10 Filed: 02/26/2014 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 404862887

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7718

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ROBERT MURRAY,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (2:11-cr-00024-RGD-DEM-1; 2:12-cv-00531-RGD)

Submitted: February 20, 2014 Decided: February 26, 2014

Before DUNCAN, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Robert Murray, Appellant Pro Se. V. Kathleen Dougherty, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Robert Murray seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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 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 Murray has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we

 $^{^{\}ast}$ The matter was referred to the magistrate judge for a report and recommendation only as to ground one in Murray's motion.

Appeal: 13-7718 Doc: 10 Filed: 02/26/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

deny a certificate of appealability 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