

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-7335

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

LAFAWN DEWAYNE BOBBITT, a/k/a Mandingo, a/k/a
Dingo,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Richard L. Williams, Senior
District Judge. (CR-97-169, CA-01-434-3)

Submitted: November 12, 2003

Decided: December 24, 2003

Before WILLIAMS, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lafawn Dewayne Bobbitt, Appellant Pro Se. Nicholas Stephan
Altimari, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia,
for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Lafawn Dewayne Bobbitt seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000). An appeal may not be taken 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 independently reviewed the record and conclude that Bobbitt 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED