**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-7215**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ISABEL GONZALEZ, a/k/a Chabello, a/k/a Isabel Garcia,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at New Bern. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:00-cr-00077-BO; 5:02-cv-000726-BO)

---

Submitted: November 20, 2007 Decided: November 29, 2007

---

Before NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Isabel Gonzalez, Appellant Pro Se. Steve R. Matheny, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Isabel Gonzalez seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of 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 Gonzalez has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Gonzalez's motion for 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