UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•			
	No. 18-6080		
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	.,		
Plaintiff - App	pellee,		
v.			
WILLIAM KINJO SMITH,			
Defendant - A	ppellant.		
Appeal from the United States I Alexandria. Leonie M. Bri 1:16-cv-00821-LMB)	District Court for th nkema, District J		of Virginia, at 00421-LMB-1;
Submitted: April 19, 2018		Decided:	April 24, 2018
Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a	and THACKER and	HARRIS, Circuit Ju	dges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.		
William Kinjo Smith, Appellant Pr	o Se.		
Unpublished opinions are not bind	ing precedent in this	circuit.	

PER CURIAM:

William Kinjo Smith 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 Smith has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Smith's motion for 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