

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-7231

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

TERRY YVONNE MARZE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Robert D. Potter, Senior District Judge. (CR-93-149, CA-97-224-3-P)

Submitted: July 7, 1998

Decided: July 29, 1998

Before MICHAEL and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Terry Yvonne Marze, Appellant Pro Se. Harry Thomas Church, Assistant United States Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Terry Yvonne Marze seeks to appeal the district court's order denying her motion filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 1998). We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Marze's contention that the Government knowingly allowed its chief witness to misrepresent his criminal history is without merit. Appellant has failed to show that there was a reasonable probability that, had the witness's most recent felony conviction been disclosed, the result of the proceeding would have been different. See Jean v. Rice, 945 F.2d 82, 87 (4th Cir. 1991). Marze's contention that codefendant Teddy Griffin bargained for Appellant's immunity in his plea agreement is belied by the record. Appellant's contentions that witnesses known by the Government to be material to her defenses were "suppressed" and that she was prosecuted because of her relationship with Griffin, raised in the district court, are abandoned on appeal because Appellant failed to raise these issues in her informal brief, as required by 4th Cir. Loc. R. 34(b). Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal substantially on the reasoning of the district court. United States v. Marze, Nos. CR-93-149; CA-97-224-3-P (W.D.N.C. Aug. 15, 1997). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequate-

ly presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED