

**UNPUBLISHED**

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

---

**No. 18-6677**

---

RA-QUAN J. DANIELS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DONNIE HARRISON,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever III, Chief District Judge. (5:17-hc-02209-D)

---

Submitted: October 16, 2018

Decided: October 18, 2018

---

Before WYNN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Ra-Quan J. Daniels, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ra-Quan J. Daniels, a state pretrial detainee, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2012) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (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 petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

Because Daniels has not challenged the court's dispositive procedural ruling in his informal brief, we conclude that he has not made the requisite showing. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) (noting importance of Rule 34(b) and reiterating that our review is limited to issues preserved in informal brief). 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*