

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-7485

CARL JEFFREYS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

JAY HAYNES, Superintendent of the Caswell
Correctional Center,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Malcolm J. Howard, District
Judge. (CA-01-612-5-HO)

Submitted: December 19, 2002

Decided: January 6, 2003

Before WILKINS and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Carl Jeffreys, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III, OFFICE
OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH CAROLINA, Raleigh, North Carolina,
for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Carl Jeffreys, a state prisoner, 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 from the final order in a habeas corpus 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) (2000). 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.) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)), cert. denied, 122 S. Ct. 318 (2001). We have reviewed the record and conclude for the reasons stated by the district court that Jeffreys has not made the requisite showing. See Jeffreys v. Haynes, No. CA-01-612-5-HO (E.D.N.C. Aug. 21, 2002); see also Davis v. Allsbrooks, 778 F.2d 168, 174-76 (4th Cir. 1985) (holding that the Wainwright v. Sykes, 433 U.S. 72, 87 (1977), bar of federal habeas review applies when a state court has found a procedural default

regardless of whether the state court alternatively has discussed the merits). 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