

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6922**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

GEORGE MARTIN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Clarksburg. Irene M. Keeley, District Judge. (1:05-cr-00021-IMK-MJA-1; 1:13-cv-00149-IMK-MJA)

---

Submitted: November 17, 2016

Decided: November 22, 2016

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, MOTZ and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

George Martin, Appellant Pro Se. Zelda Elizabeth Wesley, Assistant United States Attorney, Clarksburg, West Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

George Martin seeks to appeal the district court's orders (1) accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on most of the claims raised in Martin's 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion; and (2) denying relief on one specific aspect of Martin's ineffective assistance of counsel claim on which the court held an evidentiary hearing. The orders are 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 Martin 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