

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-6536

DONALD E. ROBINSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

CALVIN ANTHONY, Warden; HENRY DARGAN MCMASTER,
Attorney General for South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Florence. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District
Judge. (CA-04-945-HMH)

Submitted: August 31, 2005

Decided: September 9, 2005

Before WILKINSON, WILLIAMS, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Donald E. Robinson, Appellant Pro Se. William Edgar Salter, III,
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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Donald E. Robinson 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 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) (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, 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 Robinson has not made the requisite showing. Moreover, as to the portions of the magistrate judge's report to which Robinson failed to object after being warned of the consequences of such a failure, appellate review is waived. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). 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