US v. Byron Anthony Grey, Jr. Appeal: 16-6523 Doc: 12 Filed: 08/30/2016 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 406176526

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6523

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BYRON ANTHONY GREY, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, Senior District Judge. (8:08-cr-00462-RWT-1; 8:13-cv-01599-RWT)

Submitted: August 25, 2016 Decided: August 30, 2016

Before NIEMEYER, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Byron Anthony Grey, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Stacy Dawson Belf, Johnston, Assistant United Deborah A. States Attorneys, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Byron Anthony Grey, Jr., 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 debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 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 Grey 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: 16-6523 Doc: 12 Filed: 08/30/2016 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED