

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6641**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KAVIN DATRON WILLIAMS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. James C. Dever III, Chief District Judge. (4:10-cr-00088-D-1; 4:12-cv-00201-D)

---

Submitted: October 10, 2014

Decided: October 22, 2014

---

Before DUNCAN, KEENAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kavin Datron Williams, Appellant Pro Se. William Glenn Perry, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greenville, North Carolina; Shailika K. Shah, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kavin D. Williams 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, including the transcript of the evidentiary hearing conducted in the district court, and conclude that Williams has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Williams's motions for a certificate of appealability and for appointment of counsel 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