

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 04-6941**

---

LOUISE REDDITT,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (CA-04-430-1)

---

Submitted: December 16, 2004

Decided: December 21, 2004

---

Before MICHAEL, KING, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Louise Redditt, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Louise Redditt seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing without prejudice her petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) for failure to exhaust state remedies. The order is not appealable 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 her 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 Redditt has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny her motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We also deny Redditt's motion for appointment of counsel, motion to withdraw her Fairfax County court appointed attorney, motion to show cause for the warrant, and motions for trial transcripts at the government's expense. We deny as moot the motion to resume consideration of 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