

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-6048

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHEUKMA KENYATA SANDERS, a/k/a Kuma,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Richard L. Voorhees, District Judge. (5:07-cr-00050-RLV-CH-13; 5:09-cv-00135-RLV)

Submitted: April 22, 2010

Decided: April 28, 2010

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and KING and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Cheukma Kenyata Sanders, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas A. O'Malley, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina; Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Cheukma Kenyata Sanders 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 Sanders 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

* We decline to consider Sanders' claim, raised for the first time in this court, that the district court applied the Sentencing Guidelines in a mandatory fashion, and counsel failed to object. See Muth v. United States, 1 F.3d 246, 250 (4th Cir. 1993).

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED