

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-6070**

---

DENNIS WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

JOHN J. LAMANNA, et al.,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort. Patrick Michael Duffy, Senior District Judge. (9:09-cv-00271-PMD)

---

Submitted: August 26, 2010

Decided: September 1, 2010

---

Before KING, DUNCAN, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Dennis Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Barbara Murcier Bowens, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dennis Williams, a prisoner convicted of District of Columbia Code offenses, seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2241 (West 2006 & Supp. 2010) petition and denying reconsideration. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 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). 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 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