

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6994

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTOINE DEMETRIUS LUNDY, a/k/a Buff,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (2:12-cr-00106-RGD-DEM-3; 2:16-cv-00038-RGD)

Submitted: November 21, 2017

Decided: November 28, 2017

Before WYNN and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Antoine Demetrius Lundy, Appellant Pro Se. Darryl James Mitchell, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Antoine Demetrius Lundy 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 Lundy 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

* The district court's order also denied Lundy's motion for a reduction in sentence. Because Lundy does not challenge that ruling, he has forfeited appellate review of that portion of the district court's order. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b).