

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-6725**

---

JOHN EDWARD BRYANT,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

RONALD ANGELONE, Director, Virginia Department  
of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District  
Judge. (CA-02-1259-AM)

---

Submitted: July 10, 2003

Decided: July 17, 2003

---

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John Edward Bryant, Appellant Pro Se. Mary Kathleen Beatty Martin,  
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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

John Edward Bryant 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 habeas corpus proceeding in which the detention complained of arises out of process issued by a state court 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. 2001) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Bryant has not satisfied either standard. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 123 S. Ct. 1029 (2003). Accordingly, we deny Bryant's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We also deny Bryant's motions for appointment of counsel and to proceed under Fed. R. App. P.

30(f) as unnecessary. 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