

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-7220**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DENISE ANN SOUTHERLAND,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District Judge. (1:10-cr-00292-GBL-1; 1:12-cv-01043-GBL)

---

Submitted: November 19, 2013

Decided: November 22, 2013

---

Before WYNN and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Denise Ann Southerland, Appellant Pro Se. Timothy D. Belevetz, Assistant United States Attorney, Paul Nathanson, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Denise Ann Southerland seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on her 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2013) motion. The orders are 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 Southerland has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We also deny Southerland's motions to expedite and for release pending appeal and dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented

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

DISMISSED