

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6892

JAMES WALLACE FOX,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

BRICK TRIPP; US PAROLE COMMISSION,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:16-hc-02127-FL)

Submitted: November 28, 2017

Decided: January 5, 2018

Before NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James Wallace Fox, Appellant Pro Se. Roberto Francisco Ramirez, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James Wallace Fox, a District of Columbia Code offender, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2012) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012); *Wilson v. U.S. Parole Comm'n*, 652 F.3d 348, 351-52 (3d Cir. 2011); *Madley v. U.S. Parole Comm'n*, 278 F.3d 1306, 1308 (D.C. Cir. 2002).

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 petition 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 Fox 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