

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-6946

MICHAEL JERMAINE GRACE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

EDDIE BUFFALOE,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 24-6948

MICHAEL JERMAINE GRACE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

EDDIE BUFFALOE,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 24-6949

MICHAEL JERMAINE GRACE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

EDDIE BUFFALOE,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Loretta C. Biggs, District Judge. (1:22-cv-00976-LCB-JEP; 1:22-cv-00977-LCB-JEP; 1:22-cv-00978-LCB-JEP)

Submitted: December 19, 2024

Decided: December 27, 2024

Before KING and BERNER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Jermaine Grace, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Jermaine Grace seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendations of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Grace's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petitions. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A). 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 petition 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)).

Limiting our review of the records to the issues raised in Grace's informal briefs, we conclude that Grace has not made the requisite showing. *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."). Accordingly, we deny Grace's motions to appoint counsel, deny a certificate of appealability, and dismiss the appeals. 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