

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 19-6019**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MARSHA KING,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 19-6111**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MARSHA KING,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (2:14-cr-00065-RAJ-DEM-1; 2:17-cv-00644-RAJ)

---

Submitted: May 30, 2019

Decided: July 5, 2019

---

Before DIAZ and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Marsha King, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Marsha King seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on her 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion and denying King's motions for postjudgment relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). The orders are 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 King has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, although we grant King's motion to supplement in Appeal No. 19-6019, we deny her motion for a transcript at government expense in Appeal No. 19-6111, deny a certificate of appealability, and dismiss the appeals. 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*