

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7484**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ALEXANDER ASA-KWAPONG,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District Judge. (1:12-cr-00416-GBL-1; 1:13-cv-01484-GBL)

---

Submitted: January 29, 2016

Decided: March 4, 2016

---

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Alexander Asa-Kwapong, Appellant Pro Se. Karen Ledbetter Taylor, Assistant United States Attorney, Ryan K. Dickey, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Alexander Asa-Kwapong seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and denying as moot his discovery motions. 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 Asa-Kwapong 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