UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_	No. 19-6295		
MICHAEL S. OWL FEATHER-G	ORBEY,		
Petitioner - Ap	ppellant,		
v.			
FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISON	S; STATE OF MAR	RYLAND,	
Respondents -	Appellees.		
-			
Appeal from the United States Dis Richard D. Bennett, District Judge.		•	l, at Baltimore.
Submitted: June 25, 2019		Decideo	d: July 1, 2019
Before RICHARDSON and RUS Judge.	HING, Circuit Judg	ges, and SHEDD,	Senior Circuit
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.		
Michael S. Gorbey, Appellant Pro	Se.		
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ng precedent in this	circuit.	

PER CURIAM:

Michael S. Owl Feather-Gorbey, a District of Columbia Code offender incarcerated at FCI Cumberland in Maryland, seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2012) habeas 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.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Owl Feather-Gorbey has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal.

_

^{*} Because Owl Feather-Gorbey was convicted in a District of Columbia court, he is required to obtain a certificate of appealability in order to appeal the denial of his habeas petition. *See Madley v. United States Parole Comm'n*, 278 F.3d 1306, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 2002).

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