

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6774**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SOLOMON GLOVER, a/k/a Terry Tyreil Moore, a/k/a Box, a/k/a  
Tyreil Moore, a/k/a Tyreil Morgan,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Arenda L. Wright Allen,  
District Judge. (2:03-cr-00039-AWA-FBS-1; 2:13-cv-00203-AWA)

---

Submitted: September 26, 2013                      Decided: October 3, 2013

---

Before MOTZ and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Solomon Glover, Appellant Pro Se. William David Muhr, Assistant  
United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia; Timothy Richard  
Murphy, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Newport News,  
Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Solomon Glover seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2006) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2006). 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) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). 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. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Glover has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny his motion to proceed in forma pauperis, 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