

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-7297**

---

KEITH M. NEALE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

RONALD J. ANGELONE,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, District Judge. (CA-01-747)

---

Submitted: November 12, 2002

Decided: December 3, 2002

---

Before LUTTIG and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

David Bernard Hargett, HARGETT & WATSON, P.L.C., Richmond, Virginia, for Appellant. Eugene Paul Murphy, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Keith M. Neale seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000). An appeal may not be taken to this court from the final order in a § 2254 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court on the merits absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). As to claims dismissed by a district court solely on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability will not issue unless the petitioner can demonstrate both "(1) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right' and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.'" Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 684 (4th Cir. 2001) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)). We have reviewed the record and conclude for the reasons stated by the district court that Neale has not satisfied either standard. See Neale v. Angelone, No. CA-01-747 (W.D. Va. July 31, 2001). Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. 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