

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6683

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BERNARD CELESTINE, a/k/a Speed, a/k/a Beaver,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. James C. Dever III, District Judge. (4:95-cr-00041-D-9; 4:23-cv-00138-D)

Submitted: April 23, 2026

Decided: April 28, 2026

Before NIEMEYER, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Bernard Celestine, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Bernard Celestine appeals the district court's order denying the most recent motions Celestine filed in his criminal action, including a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion, a motion for compassionate release under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(a)(1)(A), and a motion for sentence reduction under the First Step Act. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *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.”).

To the extent Celestine seeks to appeal that portion of the district court's order dismissing his § 2255 motion as successive and unauthorized, 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, as here, 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)). As Celestine does not challenge the district court's dismissal of the § 2255 motion in his informal brief, he has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal, in part.

As to the remainder of the appealed order, we have reviewed the record in conjunction with the issues Celestine raises on appeal and find no reversible error.

Accordingly, we affirm the remainder of district court's order. *United States v. Celestine*, Nos. 4:95-cr-00041-D-9; 4:23-cv-00138-D (E.D.N.C. July 28, 2025). 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 IN PART,
AFFIRMED IN PART*