

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6789**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAVID RICH, a/k/a Oakie,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William D. Quarles, Jr., District Judge. (1:08-cr-00438-WDQ-1; 1:12-cv-03226-WDQ)

---

Submitted: July 24, 2014

Decided: July 29, 2014

---

Before FLOYD and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

David Rich, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Clayton Hanlon, James Thomas Wallner, Assistant United States Attorneys, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David Rich seeks to appeal the district court's order denying in part 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.

---

\* The district court granted Rich's motion in part and resentenced him. Rich appealed the sentence imposed by the district court, and we affirmed. United States v. Rich, \_\_\_ F. App'x \_\_\_, 2014 WL 2958806 (4th Cir. July 2, 2014) (No. 13-4867).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Rich 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