UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

-			
_	No. 20-6159		
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	,		
Plaintiff - App	ellee,		
v.			
MARK STEVEN BUSH, JR., a/k/a	Unc,		
Defendant - A	ppellant.		
-			
Appeal from the United States Distr Huntington. Robert C. Chambers, I			•
Submitted: October 16, 2020		Decided:	November 4, 2020
Before MOTZ, DIAZ, and HARRIS	S, Circuit Judges.		
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	nm opinion.		
Mark Steven Bush, Jr., Appellant P	ro Se.		
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ng precedent in this	circuit.	

PER CURIAM:

Mark Steven Bush, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Bush's 28 U.S.C. § 2255 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). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." § 2253(c)(2). 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)). And the timely filing of specific objections to the magistrate judge's report is necessary to preserve appellate review when the parties have been warned of the consequences of noncompliance. *Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that as to the claims for which Bush lodged timely, specific objections to the magistrate judge's report, Bush 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