

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7138

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KHALIL KENYON BLACKMAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:12-cr-00507-LMB-1; 1:14-cv-01135-LMB)

Submitted: December 11, 2015

Decided: December 22, 2015

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Khalil Kenyon Blackman, Appellant Pro Se. Gurney Wingate Grant, II, Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia; Marc Birnbaum, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Adam B. Schwartz, Karen Ledbetter Taylor, Assistant United States Attorneys, Charles Eric Douglas Mothander, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Khalil Kenyon Blackman 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 Blackman has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave 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