

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-6243**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JOHN VINCENT BAUMGARTEN, JR.; JOHN VINCENT  
BAUMGARTEN, SR.; ANTHONY QUINN BAUMGARTEN,

Defendants - Appellants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (CR-  
96-483-CCB, CA-01-1769-CCB, CA-01-1770-CCB, CA-01-1771-CCB)

---

Submitted: May 29, 2003

Decided: June 4, 2003

---

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John Vincent Baumgarten, Jr., John Vincent Baumgarten, Sr., Anthony  
Quinn Baumgarten, Appellants Pro Se. Andrea L. Smith, OFFICE OF THE  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellants seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on their motions filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000). The order is appealable only if a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). 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) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 123 S. Ct. 1029, 1040 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Appellants have 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED