

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6956**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MARION SHAWN ANDERSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:11-cr-00231-LMB-1; 1:14-cv-00126-LMB; 1:12-cv-01168-LMB)

---

Submitted: October 20, 2014

Decided: October 27, 2014

---

Before GREGORY, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Marion Shawn Anderson, Appellant Pro Se. Richard Daniel Cooke, Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia; Elizabeth Nash Eriksen, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Karen Ledbetter Taylor, Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Marion Shawn Anderson seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) 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) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 Anderson 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