

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-7643

TERRANCE EDWARD HAMMOCK,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DIRECTOR GAIL WATTS; STATE ATTORNEY MICHAEL FULLER; JUDGE
ROBERT CAHILL, JR.; JUDGE KATHLEEN COX,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Catherine C. Blake, Senior District Judge. (1:21-cv-02282-CCB)

Submitted: May 24, 2022

Decided: May 26, 2022

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Terrance Edward Hammock, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Terrance Edward Hammock, a state prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition filed while he was a pretrial detainee. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A). 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 that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is 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 Hammock has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Hammock's motion to dismiss the charges, 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