

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6650

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

NATHAN A. SILLA,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Paul W. Grimm, District Judge. (8:11-cr-00157-PWG-1; 8:15-cv-00656-PWG)

Submitted: October 13, 2016

Decided: October 18, 2016

Before NIEMEYER, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nathan A. Silla, Appellant Pro Se. David Ira Salem, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nathan A. Silla seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) 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) (2012). 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) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). 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. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Silla has not made the requisite showing.* Accordingly, we deny

* Specifically, the issues raised in Silla's informal brief in this court, which relate to the propriety of the district court's acceptance of his guilty plea and the knowing and voluntary nature of that plea, are substantively distinct from the ineffective assistance of counsel claims that Silla raised (Continued)

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

in his § 2255 motion. We decline to consider these newly framed arguments. See Muth v. United States, 1 F.3d 246, 250 (4th Cir. 1993) (recognizing this court's well-settled rule that "issues raised for the first time on appeal generally will not be considered," as well as the "very limited circumstances" that support a deviation from it).