

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 22-7027**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHARLES DUNCAN PIPPINS, a/k/a Chuck,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at  
Huntington. Robert C. Chambers, District Judge. (3:17-cr-00007-1; 3:19-cv-00876)

---

Submitted: November 17, 2022

Decided: November 23, 2022

---

Before KING, QUATTLEBAUM, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Charles Duncan Pippins, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles Duncan Pippins seeks to appeal the district court’s amended order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge in part and denying relief on Pippins’ 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 Pippins has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we 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*