

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-7096**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

TRAVIS MCKINNLEY FRIEND,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, District Judge. (CR-99-201, CA-01-836)

---

Submitted: December 11, 2003

Decided: December 19, 2003

---

Before NIEMEYER and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Travis McKinnley Friend, Appellant Pro Se. Brian Ronald Hood, Assistant United States Attorney, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Travis McKinnley Friend appeals from the denial of his 18 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion to vacate his sentence in which he alleged ineffective assistance of counsel. Friend pled guilty pursuant to a written plea agreement to conspiracy to interfere with interstate commerce, 18 U.S.C. § 1951(a) (2000), and carjacking, 18 U.S.C. § 2119 (2000). Thereafter, Friend pled guilty pursuant to a written plea agreement to a separate incident of carjacking. Both carjackings resulted in the deaths of the victims, and Friend received two life sentences.

An appeal may not be taken to this court from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless 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, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001).

We have thoroughly reviewed the record and conclude that Friend has not made the requisite showing. We therefore 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 in the decisional process.

DISMISSED