

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-7814**

---

NOLIE DEAL SAMPSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director Virginia Department  
of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

**No. 07-6101**

---

NOLIE DEAL SAMPSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director Virginia Department  
of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District  
Judge. (2:06-cv-00180)

---

Submitted: June 21, 2007

Decided: June 26, 2007

---

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Nolie Deal Sampson, Appellant Pro Se. Alice T. Armstrong, OFFICE OF  
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nolie Deal Sampson seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition and denying his motion for reconsideration. The 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 any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. 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 Sampson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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