

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-6311**

---

JOHN ROBERT DEMOS, JR., a/k/a Anwarri Shabazz,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DONALD R. HOLBROOK, Superintendent; THE U.S.A.; WASHINGTON,  
DC; THE UNITED STATES; THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, Chief District  
Judge. (1:15-cv-00250-CCB)

---

Submitted: June 19, 2015

Decided: July 6, 2015

---

Before MOTZ, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John Robert Demos, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John Robert Demos, Jr., a state prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2012) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (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 petition 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 Demos has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss the appeal. The motions for appointment of counsel, to clarify jurisdiction, and to clarify, amend, or modify are denied. 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