

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 19-6854**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JAQUAN BROOKS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.  
R. Bryan Harwell, Chief District Judge. (4:11-cr-00079-RBH-2; 4:16-cv-02006-RBH)

---

Submitted: October 17, 2019

Decided: October 22, 2019

---

Before MOTZ and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit  
Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jaquan Brooks, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jaquan Brooks 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 Brooks has not made the requisite showing. *See United States v. Mathis*, 932 F.3d 242, 266 (4th Cir. 2019) (concluding "that Hobbs Act robbery constitutes a crime of violence" under the force provision in 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)(3)(A) (2012)). Accordingly, we deny Brooks' motion for appointment of counsel, 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*