UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•		
	No. 18-6117	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	.,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
CHARLES A. GHOLSON,		
Defendant - A	ppellant.	
Appeal from the United States Di Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, Di MHL)		•
Submitted: April 25, 2019		Decided: April 29, 2019
Before FLOYD and QUATTLEB. Judge.	AUM, Circuit Judge	s, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit
Dismissed by unpublished per curi-	am opinion.	
Frances H. Pratt, Assistant Fede PUBLIC DEFENDER, Alexandria		

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles A. Gholson 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 Gholson 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