

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-7037

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ALEXANDER QUINTON HORST,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Mark S. Davis, Chief District Judge. (2:15-cr-00046-MSD-DEM-3; 2:16-cv-00221-MSD)

Submitted: February 18, 2022

Decided: March 10, 2022

Before AGEE, DIAZ, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Alexander Quinton Horst, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Alexander Quinton Horst seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for relief from the district court's prior 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. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). *See generally United States v. McRae*, 793 F.3d 392, 400 & n.7 (4th Cir. 2015). 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 Horst has not made the requisite showing. 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