

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-7154

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BILLY GENE JEFFERSON, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 18-7157

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BILLY GENE JEFFERSON, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. John A. Gibney, Jr., District Judge. (3:13-cr-00221-JAG-1; 3:14-cr-00066-JAG-DJN-1; 3:16-cv-00975-JAG; 3:16-cv-00977-JAG-DJN)

Submitted: February 26, 2019

Decided: March 1, 2019

Before KING, THACKER, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Billy Gene Jefferson, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Billy Gene Jefferson, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's single order denying relief on his two separate 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motions. 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 Jefferson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates of appealability and dismiss the appeals. 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