

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-6285

MICHAEL G. KESELICA,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

J. MICHAEL STOUFFER, Warden, Maryland
Correction Training Center; ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 07-6350

MICHAEL G. KESELICA,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

J. MICHAEL STOUFFER, Warden, Maryland
Correction Training Center; ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, Magistrate
Judge. (3:02-cv-00575)

Submitted: July 19, 2007

Decided: July 24, 2007

Before MOTZ and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael G. Keselica, Appellant Pro Se. Richard Bain Smith,
Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael G. Keselica seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's orders denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motions for reconsideration of the district court's order denying relief on his motion to reopen his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) proceeding and the order denying the first Rule 60(b) motion.* The orders are 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 Keselica has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeals. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and

*The parties consented to jurisdiction of the magistrate judge.

legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED