US v. Charlie Farmer Appeal: 16-7240 Doc: 6 Fil

Doc: 6 Filed: 02/07/2017 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7240

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHARLIE ELBERT FARMER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:09-cr-00297-BO-1; 5:16-cv-00602-BO)

Submitted: January 17, 2017 Decided: February 7, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and WILKINSON and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charlie Elbert Farmer, Appellant Pro Se. Evan Rikhye, Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 406388185

## PER CURIAM:

Charlie Elbert Farmer seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. 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 Farmer 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: 16-7240 Doc: 6 Filed: 02/07/2017 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED