

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7727

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TRENITA ASHLOCK,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (4:11-cr-00049-RGD-TEM-1; 4:12-cv-00133-RGD)

Submitted: February 20, 2014

Decided: February 26, 2014

Before DUNCAN, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Trenita Ashlock, Appellant Pro Se. Andrew Lamont Creighton, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Brian James Samuels, Assistant United States Attorney, Newport News, Virginia; Jerome M. Maiatico, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Trenita Ashlock seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on her 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. 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 Ashlock 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