

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-7464

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RODNEY ANTON WILLIAMSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:06-cr-00474-NCT-1; 1:14-cv-00870-NCT-JLW)

Submitted: April 2, 2020

Decided: April 22, 2020

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, RUSHING, Circuit Judge, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Rodney Anton Williamson, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Rodney Anton Williamson seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Williamson's 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2018) motion and denying his motion for reconsideration. The orders are 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 Williamson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Williamson's motion for 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