

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-6186

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

AWAL MOHAMMED,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
James K. Bredar, Chief District Judge. (1:12-cr-00005-JKB-2; 1:18-cv-00169-JKB)

Submitted: May 17, 2018

Decided: May 21, 2018

Before KING and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Awal Mohammed, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Awal Mohammed seeks to appeal the district court's order construing his pro se filing as a successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and dismissing it for lack of jurisdiction or, alternatively, construing the filing as a Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6) motion and denying Rule 60(b) relief. 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 Mohammed 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