Sherinette Wannamaker v. Warden Appeal: 14-7844 Doc: 12

Filed: 08/19/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 405590043

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7844

SHERINETTE WANNAMAKER, a/k/a Sheri Wannamaker,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN, Graham Correctional Institution, Camille Griffin,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Respondent.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort. Terry L. Wooten, Chief District Judge. (9:13-cv-0.2934-TLW)

Submitted: April 30, 2015 Decided: August 19, 2015

Before MOTZ and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sherinette Wannamaker, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Melody Jane Brown, John William McIntosh, Assistant Attorneys General, Alan Wilson, Appeal: 14-7844 Doc: 12 Filed: 08/19/2015 Pg: 2 of 3

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sherinette Wannamaker appeals the district court's order dismissing her 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. We previously granted a certificate of appealability on the issue of whether Wannamaker's due process rights were violated after she was denied a new trial. The Respondent has filed an informal response brief addressing this claim, and Wannamaker has filed a reply brief.

After reviewing the parties' filings and the record on appeal, we conclude that Wannamaker's claim is not cognizable on federal habeas review. See Lawrence v. Branker, 517 F.3d 700, 717 (4th Cir. 2008). Accordingly, although we grant Wannamaker leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we dismiss the claim for which we granted a certificate of appealability. With regard to Wannamaker's remaining claims, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss that portion of the appeal. We 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