

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 20-6403**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DEVIN BROWN, a/k/a Deno Badazz,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (2:16-cr-00123-RMG-5; 2:19-cv-02205-RMG)

---

Submitted: October 29, 2021

Decided: January 14, 2022

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, DIAZ, Circuit Judge, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Devin Brown, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Devin Brown seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion to amend and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). 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). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists could find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. *See Buck v. Davis*, 137 S. Ct. 759, 773-74 (2017). 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. *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Brown has not made the requisite showing. We deny Brown's motions to supplement the record, motions for transcripts, and motion for production of documents. We further deny Brown's motion for 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*