## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

-		
_	No. 20-6393	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	,	
Plaintiff - App	ellee,	
v.		
MICHAEL T. RAND,		
Defendant - A	ppellant.	
Appeal from the United States Dist. Charlotte. Robert J. Conrad, Jr., 00687-RJC)		
Submitted: February 22, 2021		Decided: March 3, 2021
Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a	nd NIEMEYER and	HARRIS, Circuit Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Michael T. Rand, Appellant Pro Se		
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ng precedent in this	circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Michael T. Rand seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 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." 28 U.S.C. § 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)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Rand has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, although we grant Rand's motion to exceed the length limitations for his informal brief, 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**