

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6999

WELDON EUGENE HOLTZCLAW, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN OF THE GREENVILLE COUNTY DETENTION CENTER,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 25-7020

WELDON EUGENE HOLTZCLAW, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN OF THE GREENVILLE COUNTY DETENTION CENTER,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Greenville. Donald C. Coggins, Jr., District Judge. (6:24-cv-07496-DCC)

Submitted: April 23, 2026

Decided: April 28, 2026

Before NIEMEYER, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Weldon Eugene Holtzclaw, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Weldon Eugene Holtzclaw, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his postjudgment motions to amend his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition.* The district court found that Holtzclaw “[had] provided no reason to reopen [the] case.” *See Daulatzai v. Maryland*, 97 F.4th 166, 178 (4th Cir. 2024) (“[A] motion to amend a complaint filed after a final judgment has been entered cannot be considered until the judgment has been vacated.”); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) (establishing specific grounds for relief from final judgment).

The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A). *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*, 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

* We previously dismissed Holtzclaw's appeal from the district court's dismissal of the § 2254 petition for failure to exhaust his administrative remedies. *See Holtzclaw v. Warden of the Greenville Cnty. Det. Ctr.*, No. 25-6255, 2025 WL 2141328 (4th Cir. July 29, 2025).

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 Holtzclaw has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Holtzclaw's pending appellate motions, 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