

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-7871**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ALVITA KAREN GUNN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, Senior District Judge. (8:09-cr-00213-RWT-4; 8:14-cv-00167-RWT)

---

Submitted: April 23, 2015

Decided: April 28, 2015

---

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Alvita Karen Gunn, Appellant Pro Se. Bryan E. Foreman, Lindsay Eyler Kaplan, Christen Anne Sproule, Assistant United States Attorneys, Adam Kenneth Ake, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Alvita Karen Gunn 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 Gunn has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Gunn's motion for bail or release pending appeal, 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