

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-6549**

---

CURTIS LEON TAYLOR, SR.,  
  
Petitioner - Appellant,  
  
v.  
  
GEORGE M. HINKLE,  
  
Respondent - Appellee.

---

**No. 10-6657**

---

CURTIS LEON TAYLOR, SR.,  
  
Petitioner - Appellant,  
  
v.  
  
GEORGE M. HINKLE,  
  
Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, Magistrate  
Judge. (3:08-cv-00306-MHL)

---

Submitted: June 9, 2010

Decided: July 9, 2010

---

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Curtis Leon Taylor, Sr., Appellant Pro Se. Susan Bland Curwood,  
Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Curtis Leon Taylor, Sr. seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition and denying reconsideration.\* The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006); 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) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Taylor has not made the requisite showing.

---

\* The parties consented to the exercise of jurisdiction by the magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2006).

Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Taylor's motion for de novo review, 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