

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-7072**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

RONALD ALEXANDER, a/k/a Fat Ronald,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Andre M. Davis, District Judge. (1:00-cr-00242-AMD; 1:06-cv-00091-AMD)

---

Submitted: February 15, 2007

Decided: February 21, 2007

---

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Edward Marr, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellant. Jamie M. Bennett, Assistant United States Attorney, Lynne Ann Battaglia, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronald Alexander seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion. 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 any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude Alexander 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

---

\*To the extent Alexander wants relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2000), he failed to show § 2255 did not provide an adequate and effective means to test the legality of his conviction and sentence. See In re Jones, 226 F.3d 328, 332-34 (4th Cir. 2000).