US v. Sumblin Doc. 920070608

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-6445

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

MARCUS LAMONT SUMBLIN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, Senior District Judge. (7:04-cr-00066-jct-1; 7:06-cv-00431-jct)

Submitted: May 31, 2007 Decided: June 8, 2007

Before WILKINSON, TRAXLER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Marcus Lamont Sumblin, Appellant Pro Se. Edward Albert Lustig, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Dockets.Justia.com

PER CURIAM:

Marcus Lamont Sumblin seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion. The order is 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 Sumblin has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED