

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-7042

TERRELL MCCOY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN JOHN PALMER,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort.
Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (9:23-cv-00089-MGL)

Submitted: July 16, 2026

Decided: July 20, 2026

Before WILKINSON, RICHARDSON, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Terrell McCoy, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Terrell McCoy seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his three motions pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1), (3), (4), (6) for relief from the district court's prior order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition. 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 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 McCoy has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny McCoy's motions for appointment of counsel and to file supplemental briefs. 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