

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-7311**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOVAN CORNELIUS SIMON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 17-7457**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOVAN CORNELIUS SIMON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at  
Florence. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge. (4:12-cr-00742-RBH-1; 4:16-cv-03282-  
RBH)

---

Submitted: April 24, 2018

Decided: May 2, 2018

---

Before AGEE, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jovan Cornelius Simon, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jovan Cornelius Simon seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. The orders are 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 Simon has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Simon's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We also deny Simon's motions for appointment of counsel and preparation of a transcript at government expense. 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*