

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-8094

MICHAEL TODD HANCOCK,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

B. WATSON, Warden, Wallens Ridge State Prison; GENE JOHNSON,
Director, Virginia Department of Corrections,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 09-8200

MICHAEL TODD HANCOCK,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

B. WATSON, Warden, Wallens Ridge State Prison; GENE JOHNSON,
Director, Virginia Department of Corrections,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior
District Judge. (2:09-cv-00247-RGD-TEM)

Submitted: May 19, 2010

Decided: June 10, 2010

Before SHEDD and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Todd Hancock, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Michael Todd Hancock appeals from the district court's orders dismissing without prejudice his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues certificates of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). 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). Where, as here, 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 v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Hancock has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, in each appeal, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny all motions pending in each case, including the motions to proceed in forma pauperis, the motions to compel copies, and the motions to waive copies. 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