

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-8083**

---

DONALD LEE WILLIAMS, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

R. H. POWELL, Warden, Brunswick Correctional  
Center,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior  
District Judge. (1:06-cv-00127-JCC)

---

Submitted: July 13, 2007

Decided: July 27, 2007

---

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Donald Lee Williams, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Drummond  
Bagwell, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Donald Lee Williams, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 Williams 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