

Filed: October 7, 2011

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6535
(1:10-cv-00203-LO-TRJ)

PIPER ANN ROUNTREE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE JOHNSON, of the Dept. of Correction of the Commonwealth
of Virginia,

Respondent - Appellee.

O R D E R

The Court amends its opinion filed October 5, 2011, as
follows:

On page 2, second line of text -- the word "his" is
corrected to read "her."

For the Court - By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor
Clerk

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6535

PIPER ANN ROUNTREE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE JOHNSON, of the Dept. of Correction of the Commonwealth
of Virginia,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, District
Judge. (1:10-cv-00203-LO-TRJ)

Submitted: September 29, 2011

Decided: October 5, 2011

Before KING, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Piper Ann Rountree, Appellant Pro Se. Susan Mozley Harris,
Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Piper Ann Rountree seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on her 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (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 petition 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 Rountree 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