UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-7997

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LAMONT ANTWON SANDERS, a/k/a Twon,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, District Judge. (1:09-cv-00957-JFM; 1:06-cr-00087-JFM-1)

Submitted: April 30, 2010

Decided: May 17, 2010

Before GREGORY, SHEDD, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lamont Antwon Sanders, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Joseph Leotta, John Walter Sippel, Jr., Assistant United States Attorneys, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lamont Antwon Sanders seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West 2009) motion and the court's summary order Supp. denying reconsideration. The orders are 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 When the district court denies relief on procedural (2003). 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 Sanders 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

2

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED