

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7890

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ALEJANDRO SALINAS GARCIA, a/k/a Alex,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Richard L. Voorhees, District Judge. (5:09-cr-00025-RLV-DCK-1; 5:13-cv-00149-RLV)

Submitted: April 29, 2016

Decided: June 7, 2016

Before DUNCAN and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dallas Craig Hughes, LAW OFFICES OF D. CRAIG HUGHES, Houston, Texas, for Appellant. Thomas Richard Ascik, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina; Steven R. Kaufman, William Michael Miller, Assistant United States Attorneys, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Alejandro Salinas Garcia 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 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 Garcia 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