

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-7148

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DEBORAH BORDEAUX,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Richard M. Gergel, District Judge. (4:02-cr-00673-RMG-5; 4:09-cv-70013-RMG)

Submitted: December 13, 2011

Decided: December 20, 2011

Before MOTZ, KING, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Deborah Bordeaux, Appellant Pro Se. Jimmie Ewing, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Deborah Bordeaux seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on her 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2011) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (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 Bordeaux has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Bordeaux's pending motions to supplement the record and amend her § 2255 motion, 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