

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 04-7513**

---

WILEY CHAPMAN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; SOUTH CAROLINA  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondents - Appellees,

and

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Respondent.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry F. Floyd, District Judge.  
(CA-03-2462-6-26AK)

---

Submitted: February 9, 2005

Decided: February 15, 2005

---

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Wiley Chapman, Appellant Pro Se. Derrick K. McFarland, OFFICE OF  
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South Carolina,  
for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Wiley Chapman seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the report and recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition as successive. 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)(A) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court 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 the district court's assessment of his constitutional claims is 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, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Chapman has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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