## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| •   |                       |                          |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| _   | No. 19-6278           |                          |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  | ,                     |                          |
| Plaintiff - App   | pellee,               |                          |
| v.  |                       |                          |
| RANDALL TERRANCE EVANS  | ,                     |                          |
| Defendant - A   | ppellant.             |                          |
| -   |                       |                          |
| Appeal from the United States Dist<br>Raleigh. James C. Dever III, Distri |                       |                          |
| Submitted: June 27, 2019  |                       | Decided: August 22, 2019 |
| Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a  | and FLOYD and RUS     | SHING, Circuit Judges.   |
| Dismissed by unpublished per curia  | am opinion.           |                          |
| Randall Terrance Evans, Appellant   | Pro Se.               |                          |
| Unpublished opinions are not bindi  | ing precedent in this | circuit.                 |

## PER CURIAM:

Randall Terrance Evans seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing 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 Evans 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**