

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-7020**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

THERESA MARIE SQUILLACOTE, a/k/a Tina, a/k/a Mary Teresa Miller, a/k/a The Swan, a/k/a Margaret, a/k/a Margit, a/k/a Margret, a/k/a Margrit, a/k/a Lisa Martin, a/k/a Resi, a/k/a Anne, a/k/a Schwan,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:98-cr-00061-CMH-2; 1:02-cv-00537-CMH)

---

Submitted: April 30, 2009

Decided: July 1, 2009

---

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Theresa Marie Squillacote, Appellant Pro Se. Ronald Leonard Walutes, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Theresa Marie Squillacote seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on her 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2008) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). 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) (2006). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Squillacote has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We grant Squillacote's motions for judicial notice, to supplement, and to amend her informal brief; we deny her motion to file electronically. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

materials before the court and argument would not aid the  
decisional process.

DISMISSED