Elenor Elguera-Stinnett v. Stacey Kincaid Appeal: 17-6589 Doc: 10

Filed: 08/18/2017 Pg: 1 of 2

Doc. 406650387

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

		VC11
_	No. 17-6589	
ELEANOR JANET ELGUERA-ST	CINNETT,	
Petitioner - Ap	pellant,	
v.		
STACEY A. KINCAID, Fairfax Co	ounty Sheriff,	
Respondent - A	Appellee.	
Appeal from the United States Da Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, Distric		
Submitted: July 27, 2017		Decided: August 18, 2017
Before TRAXLER and FLOYD, Ci	rcuit Judges, and HA	MILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	m opinion.	
Eleanor Janet Elguera-Stinnett, App	pellant Pro Se.	
Unpublished opinions are not binding	ng precedent in this c	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eleanor Janet Elguera-Stinnett seeks to appeal the district court's order denying her Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of the district court's order denying relief on her 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 petition 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 Elguera-Stinnett has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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