

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7679

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

SHONIKA GAIL ECKLES, a/k/a Nika,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Richard L. Voorhees, District Judge. (5:05-cr-00009-RLV-DCK-3; 5:11-cv-00068-RLV)

Submitted: March 10, 2015

Decided: March 19, 2015

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Shonika Gail Eckles, Appellant Pro Se. William Michael Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, Kevin Zolot, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina; Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Jill Westmoreland Rose, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Shonika Gail Eckles seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on her 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 Eckles has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Eckles' motion for a transcript at Government expense, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

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

DISMISSED