

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-6888

KAOTHA LAMONT HANCOCK,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

JENNIFER H. LANGLEY, Superintendent,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. Frank W. Bullock, Jr., District Judge. (CA-04-775-1-FWB)

Submitted: September 29, 2005

Decided: October 11, 2005

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kaotha Lamont Hancock, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge III, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Kaotha Lamont Hancock, a state prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (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). 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 the district court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Hancock has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Hancock's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Hancock's motion to proceed in forma pauperis and 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