

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-6642

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANTONIO SHROPSHIRE, a/k/a Brill, a/k/a B, a/k/a Tony,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Catherine C. Blake, Senior District Judge. (1:16-cr-00051-CCB-3; 1:21-cv-00202-CCB)

Submitted: March 4, 2024

Decided: April 24, 2024

Before RICHARDSON, Circuit Judge, and KEENAN and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Antonio Shropshire, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Antonio Shropshire 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*, 580 U.S. 100, 115-17 (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 Shropshire has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, although we grant Shropshire's motion to supplement his application for a certificate of appealability, we deny his motion for 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