US v. Monica McCant Appeal: 14-4722

Doc: 10 Filed: 12/18/2014 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 405273035

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-4722

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MONICA MCCANTS, a/k/a Money,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. James K. Bredar, District Judge. (1:11-cr-00426-JKB-4; 1:14-cv-02164-JKB)

Submitted: December 16, 2014 Decided: December 18, 2014

Before DUNCAN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Monica McCants, Appellant Pro Se. Anthony Joseph Enright, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Robert Reeves Harding, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Monica McCants seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely her 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) 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) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 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 McCants 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: 14-4722 Doc: 10 Filed: 12/18/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED