

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6066

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LEWIS CARNELL JACKSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:07-cr-00110-FL-1; 5:12-cv-00205-FL)

Submitted: July 20, 2015

Decided: July 22, 2015

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Lee Davis, III, Lumberton, North Carolina, for Appellant. Jennifer P. May-Parker, Ethan A. Ontjes, Assistant United States Attorneys, Seth Morgan Wood, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lewis Carnell Jackson seeks to appeal the district court's December 2014 order adopting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his claim under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) that counsel rendered ineffective assistance by not communicating a plea agreement to him prior to trial.

This 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 Jackson 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