

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 05-6520

---

ALFRED LASURE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS;  
HENRY DARGAN MCMASTER, Attorney General for  
South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Rock Hill. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge.  
(CA-04-944-RBH)

---

Submitted: July 14, 2005

Decided: July 27, 2005

---

Before WILKINSON, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Alfred LaSure, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Chief Deputy  
Attorney General, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Alfred LaSure, a South Carolina prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the recommendation of the 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 § 2254 proceeding 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 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 both 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 LaSure 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