

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6705**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JEDENE RANDOLPH ROOKS, a/k/a Jedene Randy Rooks, a/k/a  
Skeet,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Newport News. Mark S. Davis, District  
Judge. (4:07-cr-00142-MSD-JEB-1; 4:11-cv-00144-MSD)

---

Submitted: September 25, 2014                      Decided: September 30, 2014

---

Before WILKINSON and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jedene Randolph Rooks, Appellant Pro Se. Jessica M. Norris,  
Special Assistant United States Attorney, Bradley Daniel Price,  
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Newport News, Virginia,  
for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jedene Randolph Rooks 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 and conclude that Rooks has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny his motion for 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