

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-6469**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MUHIDIN SALAD OMAR, a/k/a Muhiyaden Salad, a/k/a Gurdan, a/k/a Gardan,  
a/k/a Gurden, a/k/a Muhdin, a/k/a Dudan,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, Senior District Judge. (2:11-cr-00034-RBS-DEM-9; 2:22-cv-00386-RBS)

---

Submitted: November 21, 2023

Decided: November 28, 2023

---

Before WILKINSON and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Muhidin Salad Omar, Appellant Pro Se. Joseph Attias, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Muhidin Salad Omar seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. *See Whiteside v. United States*, 775 F.3d 180, 182-83 (4th Cir. 2014) (en banc) (explaining that § 2255 motions are subject to one-year statute of limitations, running from latest of four commencement dates enumerated in 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f)). The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 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, 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 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 Omar 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*