US v. Joshua Jimenez Appeal: 14-6165 Doc: 9 Filed: 05/29/2014 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6165

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOSHUA JIMENEZ,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (1:10-cr-00633-CCB-1; 1:13-cv-01610-CCB)

Submitted: May 22, 2014 Decided: May 29, 2014

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and HAMILTON and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joshua Jimenez, Appellant Pro Se. Benjamin M. Block, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 404992240

## PER CURIAM:

Joshua Jimenez seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge a certificate of appealability. § 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 When the district court denies relief on procedural (2003).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 Jimenez has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal Appeal: 14-6165 Doc: 9 Filed: 05/29/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED