

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-7851

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DERRICK LAMONT JONES,

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-00653-RBH-1; 4:17-cv-03070-RBH-1)

Submitted: June 18, 2020

Decided: June 22, 2020

Before FLOYD, THACKER, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Derrick Lamont Jones, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Derrick Lamont Jones seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for relief from the district court's prior 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. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2018). *See generally United States v. McRae*, 793 F.3d 392, 400 & n.7 (4th Cir. 2015). 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 could 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 Jones has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we 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