

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-6000

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BENITEZ AUGUARIUS MOODY,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (2:16-cr-00124-HCM-DEM-1; 2:20-cv-00072-RAJ-DEM)

Submitted: July 20, 2021

Decided: July 22, 2021

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Benitez Auguarius Moody, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Benitez Auguarius Moody seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion. The orders are 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)).

Limiting our review of the record to the issues raised in Moody's informal brief, we conclude that Moody has not made the requisite showing. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *see also Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, we deny the motion for a certificate of appealability, deny Moody's motion to place the appeal in abeyance while he is in transit, deny Moody's motions for transcripts, 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