

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-6401

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JAMES ALEXANDER BENSON, a/k/a Jamie Benson,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District Judge. (CR-00-626, CA-02-67-3-20)

Submitted: July 10, 2003

Decided: July 16, 2003

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James Alexander Benson, Appellant Pro Se. Stacey Denise Haynes, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

James Alexander Benson seeks to appeal the district court's orders adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation, denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000), and denying reconsideration. The orders are not appealable 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 absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Benson has not made the requisite showing. 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