

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-6119

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SAUNDRA LUCILLE WHITE, a/k/a Lucille Parrish-White, a/k/a L. Sandra White,
a/k/a L. Sandra Parrish White, a/k/a Lucille S. White, a/k/a Lucille P. White, a/k/a
Lucille Parrish, a/k/a Sandra L. Parrish,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Paul W. Grimm, District Judge. (8:13-cr-00436-PWG-1; 8:20-cv-02364-PWG)

Submitted: December 20, 2022

Decided: December 22, 2022

Before NIEMEYER and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sandra Lucille White, Appellant Pro Se. Elizabeth G. Wright, OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sandra Lucille White seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing as untimely her 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion and denying her motion for reconsideration. *See Whiteside v. United States*, 775 F.3d 180, 182-83 (4th Cir. 2014) (en banc) (explaining that § 2255 motions are subject to one-year statute of limitations, running from latest of four commencement dates enumerated in 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f)). The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). 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). When, as here, 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. *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that White 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