

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-7575**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

CARSON DARRELL RODGERS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 06-6576**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

CARSON DARRELL RODGERS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. William L. Osteen, Senior District Judge. (1:02-cr-00374-WLO; 1:04-cv-00498)

---

Submitted: September 26, 2006

Decided: September 28, 2006

---

Before WIDENER and WILKINSON, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Carson Darrell Rodgers, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Francis Joseph,  
Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Carson Darrell Rodgers seeks to appeal the district court's orders adopting the recommendations of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion and subsequent motion to reopen judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). These orders are 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 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 Rodgers has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Rodgers' motions for certificates of appealability and dismiss the 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