

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-7041

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LAWRENCE LEO HAWKINS, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (2:04-cr-00060-RAJ-TEM-1; 2:07-cv-00287-RAJ)

Submitted: March 30, 2010

Decided: June 3, 2010

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and MOTZ and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lawrence Leo Hawkins, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. William David Muhr, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lawrence Leo Hawkins, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). 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) (2006). 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 that Hawkins has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We also deny Hawkins' motions for transcript and documents at Government expense, for copies of documents needed to complete appeal, and for injunctive relief pending 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