US v. Walker Doc. 920080722

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-7848

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

RONALD E. WALKER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Charleston. Joseph R. Goodwin, Chief District Judge. (2:01-cr-00103; 2:03-2193)

Submitted: June 26, 2008 Decided: July 22, 2008

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronald E. Walker, Appellant Pro Se. Stephanie Lou Haines, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Huntington, West Virginia; Michael Lee Keller, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Samuel David Marsh, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Ronald E. Walker seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion and his motion to amend. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). 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) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Walker has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Walker's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED