US v. David Lewi Doc. 406558766 Appeal: 16-7133 Doc: 14 Filed: 06/08/2017 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7133

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAVID LEWIS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:11-cr-00229-F-8; 5:14-cv-00374-F)

Submitted: December 16, 2016 Decided: June 8, 2017

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

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David Lewis, Appellant Pro Se. Shailika S. Kotiya, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David Lewis 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 (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 Lewis has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Lewis' motion to appoint counsel, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented

Appeal: 16-7133 Doc: 14 Filed: 06/08/2017 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED