UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No		1	4-	6	3	6	5
$\mathbf{T}AC$	•		I	v	J	u	J

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

COURTNEY OMAR BOYD, a/k/a Omar,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Mark S. Davis, District Judge. (4:06-cr-00005-MSD-FBS-3; 4:11-cv-00140-MSD)

Submitted: June 19, 2014 Decided: June 23, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Courtney Omar Boyd, Appellant Pro Se. Eric Matthew Hurt, Assistant United States Attorney, Newport News, Virginia; Blair C. Perez, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Courtney Omar Boyd seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice motion. or judge issues a certificate of appealability. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). 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 Boyd 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 contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED