UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 26-6427

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

IVORY JOE TISDALE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder, District Judge. (1:20-cr-00209-TDS-1; 1:22-cv-01029-TDS-JEP)

Submitted: August 27, 2026 Decided: September 1, 2026

Before KING, HEYTENS, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ivory Joe Tisdale, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ivory Joe Tisdale seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Tisdale's amended 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion and related motions. 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). 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 Tisdale has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Tisdale's motion for 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