

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-6432

JONATHAN JOSEPH LIND,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

RALPH TERRY, Superintendent,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

DAVID BALLARD, Warden,

Respondent.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at
Charleston. Thomas E. Johnston, Chief District Judge. (2:14-cv-26284)

Submitted: November 17, 2022

Decided: November 22, 2022

Before KING, QUATTLEBAUM, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jonathan Joseph Lind, Appellant Pro Se. Lindsay Sara See, OFFICE OF THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jonathan Joseph Lind seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Lind's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition. The order is 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 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 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)).

Limiting our review of the record to the issues raised in Lind's informal brief, we conclude that Lind has not made the requisite showing. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *see also Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, we grant Lind's motion to supplement the informal appendix, deny his motion to certify, deny his motions to appoint counsel, 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