

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-7586**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DONALD ELLIOTT CROMWELL, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Richard D. Bennett, District Judge. (1:08-cr-00401-RDB-1; 1:14-cv-00778-RDB)

---

Submitted: February 25, 2015

Decided: March 2, 2015

---

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Donald Elliott Cromwell, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, James G. Warwick, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Donald Elliott Cromwell, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order granting Cromwell's request to voluntarily dismiss 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.

On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Cromwell's informal brief does not challenge the district court's order, Cromwell has forfeited appellate review of the order. 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