US v. Steven Parker Appeal: 16-7460

Filed: 03/21/2017 Pg: 1 of 2 Doc: 5

## **UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

|   | No. 16-7460           |                         |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  | ۸,                    |                         |
| Plaintiff – Ap  | pellee,               |                         |
| v.  |                       |                         |
| STEVEN VERNARD PARKER,  |                       |                         |
| Defendant - A   | appellant.            |                         |
|   |                       |                         |
| Appeal from the United States I<br>Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, I<br>00326-RAJ) |                       | •                       |
| Submitted: February 17, 2017  |                       | Decided: March 21, 2017 |
| Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a  | and DUNCAN and H      | ARRIS, Circuit Judges.  |
| Dismissed by unpublished per curi   | am opinion.           |                         |
| Steven Vernard Parker, Appellant UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,                        |                       | •                       |
| Unpublished opinions are not bind   | ing precedent in this | circuit.                |

Doc. 406447506

## PER CURIAM:

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

**DISMISSED**