

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-6241

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

GREGORY GIBSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.
Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (4:18-cr-00964-MGL-1; 4:22-cv-00461-MGL; 4:23-cv-03058-MGL)

Submitted: July 21, 2025

Decided: August 14, 2024

Before WYNN and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gregory Gibson, Appellant Pro Se. Lauren L. Hummel, Assistant United States Attorney,
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Florence, South Carolina, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gregory Gibson seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion and denying his motion to alter or amend judgment.* The orders are 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 Gibson 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

* We limit our review to issues in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 22(a)(1)(B), 34(b); *Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014); *United States v. Sosa*, 364 F.3d 507, 511 n.5 (4th Cir. 2004).