

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-7519**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DERRICK RAYSHAWN PARKS, a/k/a Bam, a/k/a Bam Parks, a/k/a  
Rayshawn Parks,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Richard L.  
Voorhees, District Judge. (5:05-cr-00257-RLV-DCK-2; 5:13-cv-  
00012-RLV)

---

Submitted: January 15, 2015

Decided: January 21, 2015

---

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

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Derrick Rayshawn Parks, Appellant Pro Se. William Michael  
Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, Adam Christopher  
Morris, Thomas A. O'Malley, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES  
ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina; Gretchen C.F. Shappert,  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Derrick Rayshawn Parks 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 Parks 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