

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6176

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ANNE MARIE CHAMBERS, a/k/a Sugar, a/k/a Anne Marie Jack,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:94-cr-00089-REP-RCY-2; 3:16-cv-00370-REP-RCY)

Submitted: June 22, 2017

Decided: June 27, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and FLOYD and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anne Marie Chambers, Appellant Pro Se. Richard Daniel Cooke, Assistant United States Attorney, David Vincent Harbach, II, Brian R. Hood, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anne Marie Chambers seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing her 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion as successive and unauthorized. 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 (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 Chambers 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 contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED