

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-6807

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RODERICK LAMAR SANFORD,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. William L. Osteen, Jr., District Judge. (1:18-cr-00193-WO-1; 1:20-cv-00539-WO-LPA)

Submitted: January 30, 2024

Decided: February 6, 2024

Before KING, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Roderick Lamar Sanford, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Roderick Lamar Sanford seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Sanford's 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*, 580 U.S. 100, 115-17 (2017).

On appeal, Sanford seeks to challenge the district court's rejection of several of his claims that plea counsel rendered ineffective assistance of counsel. Limiting our review of the record to the issues raised in Sanford's informal brief, we conclude that reasonable jurists could not debate the court's resolution of these claims. *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 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