## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

-		
	No. 18-7055	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	.,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
GILBERTO RAMOS,		
Defendant - A	ppellant.	
Appeal from the United States D. Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinker 00152-LMB)		
Submitted: February 28, 2019		Decided: March 19, 2019
Before WILKINSON, KEENAN, a	and FLOYD, Circuit	Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.	
Milena Nelson Blake, STANFO California, for Appellant.	RD UNIVERSITY	SCHOOL OF LAW, Stanford,
Unpublished opinions are not bind	ing precedent in this	circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Gilberto Ramos 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 Ramos has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, 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**