

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6773**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JEROME DANEK GLEATON, a/k/a Jerome Danek Gleatin, a/k/a Jerome  
Gleason, a/k/a Ronnie,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District  
Judge. (3:12-cr-00063-HEH-DJN-1; 3:13-cv-00434-HEH-DJN)

---

Submitted: November 17, 2016                      Decided: November 22, 2016

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and MOTZ and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jerome Danek Gleaton, Appellant Pro Se. Olivia L. Norman, OFFICE  
OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jerome Danek Gleaton seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing 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 Gleaton has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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