

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 22-6195**

---

ABDU-SALIM GOULD, a/k/a Salimabdu Gould,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

TODD E. ISHEE, Commissioner, Director of Department of Public Safety,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

**No. 22-6255**

---

ABDU-SALIM GOULD, a/k/a Salimabdu Gould,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

TODD E. ISHEE, Commissioner, Director of Department of Public Safety,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at  
Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:20-hc-02176-FL)

---

Submitted: July 21, 2022

Decided: July 26, 2022

---

Before MOTZ, HARRIS, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Abdu-Salim Gould, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Abdu-Salim Gould seeks to appeal the district court's orders: (1) denying his motion for entry of default, for default judgment, for summary judgment, and for a stay or injunction pending discovery (No. 22-6195); and (2) dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition as a duplicative petition (No. 22-6255). The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 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, as here, 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 Gould has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Gould's motion for a default judgment, deny a certificate of appealability, and dismiss the appeals. 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*