

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-6724

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DESHAWN MARCUS KING,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:13-cr-00296-BO-2; 5:17-cv-00039-BO)

Submitted: July 8, 2021

Decided: July 20, 2021

Before KING and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Deshawn Marcus King, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Deshawn Marcus King seeks to appeal the district court's order 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 King 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

* We previously remanded this case to the district court for the limited purpose of determining whether King's notice of appeal was timely filed under Fed. R. App. P. 4(c)(1) and *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988). The district court concluded that King timely filed a notice of appeal.