## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•		
_	No. 20-6078	
FRANCISCO GOMEZ,		
Petitioner - Ap	ppellant,	
v.		
HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director,		
Respondent - A	Appellee.	
Appeal from the United States Dalexandria. Liam O'Grady, Senior		•
Submitted: May 21, 2020		Decided: May 27, 2020
Before AGEE and QUATTLEBA Judge.	UM, Circuit Judges	s, and TRAXLER, Senior Circui
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Francisco Gomez, Appellant Pro Se	e.	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ng precedent in this	circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Francisco Gomez, a Virginia inmate, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2018) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (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 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 petition 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 Gomez 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**