US v. Theophilus Akwei

Appeal: 15-6004 Doc: 10 Filed: 06/02/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6004

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

THEOPHILUS AKWEI,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (1:11-cr-00199-JCC-6; 1:14-cv-00622-JCC)

Submitted: May 19, 2015 Decided: June 2, 2015

Before NIEMEYER, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Theophilus Akwei, Appellant Pro Se. James Philip Gillis, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 405485342

PER CURIAM:

Theophilus Akwei 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 district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 debatable or wrong. (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 Akwei 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

Appeal: 15-6004 Doc: 10 Filed: 06/02/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED