

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-7890

CARL ANTHONY BLAIN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

RONALD J. ANGELONE, Director of the Virginia
Department of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District
Judge. (CA-02-177-2)

Submitted: January 30, 2003

Decided: February 5, 2003

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Carl Anthony Blain, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Thomas Judge, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Carl Anthony Blain, a Virginia prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the report and recommendation of a magistrate judge and 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). When, as here, a district court dismisses a § 2254 petition 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 Blain has not made the requisite showing. See Blain v. Angelone, No. CA-02-177-2 (E.D. Va. filed Nov. 26, 2002; entered Nov. 27, 2002). 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