

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-6262**

---

TRE'VAUGHN JACKSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

BRIAN KENDALL, Warden, Lieber Correctional Institution,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

BRYAN STIRLING, Commissioner, South Carolina Department of Corrections,

Respondent.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (5:22-cv-00402-MGL)

---

Submitted: November 21, 2023

Decided: December 27, 2023

---

Before WILKINSON and KING, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Elizabeth Anne Franklin-Best, ELIZABETH FRANKLIN-BEST, P.C., Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tre’Vaughn Jackson seeks to appeal the district court’s order denying relief on his 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*, 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 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 Jackson 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*