

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-7080

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RAYMOND IDEMUDIA AIGBEKAEN,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 23-6093

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RAYMOND IDEMUDIA AIGBEKAEN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
James K. Bredar, Chief District Judge. (1:15-cr-00462-JKB-2; 1:21-cv-01259-JKB)

Submitted: January 18, 2024

Decided: February 16, 2024

Before WYNN and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and MOTZ, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Raymond Idemudia Aigbekaen, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Fitzgerald Aubin, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond Idemudia Aigbekaen seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 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*, 580 U.S. 100, 115-17 (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 Aigbekaen has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Aigbekaen's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We further deny all pending motions. 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