UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

UNPUBLISHED

No. 11-7224

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

NINA MARIE STRICKLAND,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Graham C. Mullen, Senior District Judge. (3:07-cr-00005-FDW-1; 3:11-cv-00279-GCM)

Submitted: November 15, 2011 Decided: November 18, 2011

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

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nina Marie Strickland, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas A. O'Malley, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 403627692

Appeal: 11-7224 Document: 5 Date Filed: 11/18/2011 Page: 2 of 3

PER CURIAM:

Nina Marie Strickland seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely 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). Α certificate appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists find that the district court's assessment 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 Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Strickland 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 Appeal: 11-7224 Document: 5 Date Filed: 11/18/2011 Page: 3 of 3

presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED