

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-7285

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

MICHAEL SHOWELL,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Herbert N. Maletz, Senior Judge, sitting by designation. (CR-97-424, CA-99-3561-HNM)

Submitted: December 5, 2000

Decided: December 19, 2000

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Showell, Appellant Pro Se. Jane Meadowcroft Erisman, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Michael Showell appeals the district court's denial of his motion filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2000) and asserts only one claim on appeal: that he received ineffective assistance of counsel when counsel did not note a requested appeal. The district court has granted a certificate of appealability as to Showell's claim that his attorney failed to note an appeal. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability as to all remaining claims and dismiss the entire appeal on the reasoning of the district court. See United States v. Showell, Nos. CR-97-424; CA-99-3561-HNM (D. Md. Aug. 9, 2000). 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