

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7343**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JERMAINE OTEASO OGATDES BENNETT, a/k/a Jermaine Oteaso  
Bennett,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder,  
District Judge. (1:10-cr-00210-TDS-1; 1:12-cv-00880-TDS-JLW)

---

Submitted: January 28, 2016

Decided: February 5, 2016

---

Before MOTZ, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jermaine Oteaso Ogatdes Bennett, Appellant Pro Se. Lisa Blue  
Boggs, Robert Michael Hamilton, Angela Hewlett Miller, Assistant  
United States Attorneys, Greensboro, North Carolina, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jermaine Oteaso Ogatdes Bennett seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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 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 Bennett 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

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

DISMISSED