US v. David Burnside Appeal: 15-6851

Doc: 13 Filed: 11/24/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 405724334

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6851

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAVID BURNSIDE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Richard D. Bennett, District Judge. (1:05-cr-00586-RDB-1; 1:15-cv-00020-RDB)

Submitted: October 19, 2015 Decided: November 24, 2015

Before NIEMEYER, GREGORY, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David Burnside, Appellant Pro Se. Paul Michael Cunningham, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David Burnside 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 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 Burnside 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: 15-6851 Doc: 13 Filed: 11/24/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED