

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-7359**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JERMAINE R. WOODBURY,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge. (8:07-cv-02809-AW; 8:03-cr-00501-AW-1)

---

Submitted: November 30, 2010

Decided: December 3, 2010

---

Before WILKINSON, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Wein, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellant. Barbara Suzanne Skalla, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jermaine R. Woodbury seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). 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) (2006). 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 Woodbury has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Woodbury's pending motion to appoint counsel, deny a certificate of appealability, and dismiss the appeal. We deny Woodbury's motion to schedule 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