UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

-		
_	No. 20-6999	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	,	
Plaintiff - App	pellee,	
v.		
MARCUS ROBERT WILLIAMS,		
Defendant - A	ppellant.	
Appeal from the United States Dist Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, Dist		
Submitted: December 22, 2020		Decided: December 29, 2020
Before NIEMEYER, FLOYD, and	RICHARDSON, Cir	rcuit Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Marcus Robert Williams, Appellan	t Pro Se.	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ing precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Marcus Robert Williams 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 Williams has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny the motions for a certificate of appealability and to appoint counsel 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