

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-7486

JULIAN KENNETH ARMEL, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia
Department of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 05-7487

JULIAN KENNETH ARMEL, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia
Department of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Jerome B. Friedman, District
Judge. (CA-04-600-JBF-FBS; CA-04-601-JBF-FBS)

Submitted: March 3, 2006

Decided: March 28, 2006

Before LUTTIG and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Julian Kenneth Armel, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Robert H. Anderson,
III, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond,
Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Julian Kenneth Armel, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the report and recommendation of a magistrate judge and denying relief on his petitions 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 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 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 in both cases and conclude that Armel has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates of appealability and dismiss both appeals. 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