

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-7758**

---

M. RODNEY E. JONES,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; HENRY MCMASTER,  
Attorney General,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Columbia. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge.  
(CA-05-251-MBS)

---

Submitted: December 21, 2005

Decided: January 23, 2006

---

Before NIEMEYER and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

M. Rodney E. Jones, Appellant Pro Se. Melody Jane Brown, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

M. Rodney E. Jones, a state prisoner, 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 § 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 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, 338 (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 Jones 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