US v. Charlotte Johnson Appeal: 13-7926 Doc: 8 Filed: 04/29/2014 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 404952326

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7926

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHARLOTTE JOHNSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Rebecca Beach Smith, Chief District Judge. (4:11-cr-00109-RBS-FBS-1; 4:13-cv-00111-RBS)

Submitted: April 17, 2014 Decided: April 29, 2014

Before KEENAN, WYNN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charlotte Johnson, Appellant Pro Se. Eric Matthew Hurt, Assistant United States Attorney, Newport News, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charlotte Johnson seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on her 28 U.S.C. § 2255 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). certificate of appealability will issue not absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When the district court denies relief merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard on 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 Johnson 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: 13-7926 Doc: 8 Filed: 04/29/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED