

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-8015**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ONEIL MARKEITH WATSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, District Judge. (2:08-cr-00045-RBS-FBS-1; 2:09-cv-00195-RBS-FBS)

---

Submitted: May 26, 2010

Decided: June 8, 2010

---

Before WILKINSON, SHEDD, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Oneil Markeith Watson, Appellant Pro Se. D. Monique Broadnax, Special Assistant United States Attorney, James Ashford Metcalfe, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Oneil Markeith Watson 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). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Watson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Watson's motion for transcripts at the Government's expense, 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