

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-7632

EDWARD PERNELL HARRIS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

JOSEPH BROOKS, Warden Federal Correctional
Complex Petersburg, Virginia; DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, D.C.; RECORDS CENTER, D.C.,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior
District Judge. (CA-03-1003-1)

Submitted: March 18, 2005

Decided: April 5, 2005

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Edward Pernell Harris, Appellant Pro Se. Rachel Celia Ballow,
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Edward Pernell Harris, a prisoner in federal custody serving a sentence imposed by the District of Columbia, seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2000). The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000); see Madley v. United States Parole Comm'n, 278 F.3d 1306, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 2002). 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, 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 Harris 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