## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•			
	No. 19-7410		
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	.,		
Plaintiff - App	pellee,		
v.			
JIMMIE HARRIS, a/k/a, Black			
Defendant - A	ppellant.		
Appeal from the United States I Charleston. Margaret B. Seymour cv-02603-MBS)			
Submitted: March 31, 2020		Decided:	April 14, 2020
Before MOTZ and AGEE, Circuit	Judges, and SHEDD	, Senior Circuit Jud	lge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.		
Jimmie Harris, Appellant Pro Se.			
Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.			

## PER CURIAM:

Jimmie Harris seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2018) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2018). 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) (2018). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. *See Buck v. Davis*, 137 S. Ct. 759, 773-74 (2017). 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. *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Harris has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Harris' motion to appoint 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**