UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No.	1	1-	6	6	3	4
NO.	Т	т-	O	O	.5	4

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CARLOS WOODS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William D. Quarles, Jr., District Judge. (1:07-cr-00127-WDQ-1; 1:10-cv-01321-WDQ)

Submitted: July 21, 2011 Decided: July 26, 2011

Before NIEMEYER and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Carlos Woods, Appellant Pro Se. John Walter Sippel, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Jason M. Weinstein, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Carlos Woods seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or motion. judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). 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. 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Woods 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