US v. Wilbert Sampson

Appeal: 15-7842 Doc: 8 Filed: 03/22/2016 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7842

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILBERT SAMPSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Richard D. Bennett, District Judge. (1:10-cr-00775-RDB-7; 1:13-cv-02781-RDB)

Decided: March 22, 2016 Submitted: March 17, 2016

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Wilbert Sampson, Appellant Pro Se. Ayn Brigoli Ducao, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 405879825

## PER CURIAM:

Wilbert Sampson 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 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 Sampson 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: 15-7842 Doc: 8 Filed: 03/22/2016 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED