US v. Jeromey Mitchell Appeal: 16-7100

Doc: 9 Filed: 01/30/2017 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7100

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JEROMEY KEITH MITCHELL, a/k/a Kaos,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. James C. Dever III, Chief District Judge. (4:13-cr-00023-D-1; 4:15-cv-00152-D)

Submitted: January 18, 2017 Decided: January 30, 2017

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeromey Keith Mitchell, Appellant Pro Se. Dena Janae King, Seth Morgan Wood, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 406375753

PER CURIAM:

Jeromey Keith Mitchell 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. See 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 Mitchell 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

Appeal: 16-7100 Doc: 9 Filed: 01/30/2017 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED