

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-7888**

---

JUAN CABRERA-FLORES,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ENNIS OATES,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle,  
District Judge. (5:12-hc-02175-BO)

---

Submitted: April 17, 2014

Decided: April 21, 2014

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Juan Cabrera-Flores, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge,  
III, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North  
Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Juan Cabrera-Flores seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion. Cabrera-Flores may not appeal unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (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 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 Cabrera-Flores has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Cabrera-Flores' motion to appoint counsel, 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