

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-6532

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

AKIN SEAN EL PRECISE BEY,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Raleigh. W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge. (5:15-cr-00166-BR-1; 5:19-cv-00209-BR)

Submitted: July 29, 2021

Decided: August 12, 2021

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, WYNN, Circuit Judge, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Akin Sean El Precise Bey, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Akin Sean El Precise Bey seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 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*, 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)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Bey has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we grant his motions to file supplemental briefs, 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

* We decline to address Bey's arguments raised for the first time on appeal. *See Pornomo v. United States*, 814 F.3d 681, 686 (4th Cir. 2016).