Doc: 9 Filed: 10/15/2012 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 404125413

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6984

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

VICTORIA BOATENG,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (1:05-cr-00422-CCB-2; 1:09-cv-01858-CCB)

Submitted: October 11, 2012 Decided: October 15, 2012

Before KING, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Victoria Boateng, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Clayton Hanlon, Assistant United States Attorney, James G. Warwick, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Victoria Boateng seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on her 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. § 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 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 Boateng 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 Appeal: 12-6984 Doc: 9 Filed: 10/15/2012 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED