

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-7482**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CURTIS RICHARDSON, a/k/a Curtis D. Richardson, a/k/a Curtis Dale Richardson,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.  
R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge. (4:15-cr-00492-RBH-1; 4:16-cv-02981-RBH)

---

Submitted: April 24, 2018

Decided: May 29, 2018

---

Before NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Curtis Richardson, Appellant Pro Se. Christopher Dolan Taylor, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Curtis Richardson 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 Richardson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Richardson's motion for bail or release pending appeal, 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*