

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 17-7650**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

GABRIEL DANIEL MORRISON MITCHELL, a/k/a G,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Mark S. Davis, District Judge. (4:12-cr-00010-MSD-LRL-2; 4:16-cv-00004-MSD)

---

Submitted: August 6, 2018

Decided: October 24, 2018

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and NIEMEYER and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Gabriel Daniel Morrison Mitchell, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gabriel Daniel Morrison Mitchell 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 Mitchell has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, while we grant Mitchell's motion to supplement his memorandum in support of a certificate of appealability, 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*