

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-6477**

---

CARNIE NORRIS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

RICKIE HARRISON, Warden of Kershaw Correc-  
tional Institution; CHARLES M. CONDON, Attor-  
ney General of the State of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

**No. 00-6770**

---

CARNIE NORRIS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

RICKIE HARRISON, Warden of Kershaw Correc-  
tional Institution; CHARLES M. CONDON, Attor-  
ney General of the State of North Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Charleston. David C. Norton, District Judge.  
(CA-99-807-2-18AJ)

---

Submitted: August 24, 2000

Decided: August 30, 2000

---

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

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Carnie Norris, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Carnie Norris seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his petition filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2254 (West 1994 & Supp. 1998) and the district court's order denying his request for a certificate of appealability filed after dismissal of his § 2254 petition. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and find no reversible error with regard to the dismissal without prejudice of Norris' § 2254 petition. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal as to that order on the reasoning of the district court. See Norris v. Harrison, No. CA-99-807-2-18AJ (D.S.C. Mar. 24, 2000). We further deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss Norris' appeal of the district court's denial of a certificate of appealability as Norris fails to make a substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right. See 28 U.S.C.A. § 2253(c)(2) (West Supp. 2000). 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