

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-6876**

---

WILLIAM BAGGETT,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

JOSEPH HALL; REUBEN FRANKLIN YOUNG,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

**No. 11-6877**

---

JAMES POWELL,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

SANDRA THOMAS; REUBEN FRANKLIN YOUNG,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

**No. 11-6878**

---

LEROY RICHARDSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HERBERT JACKSON; REUBEN FRANKLIN YOUNG,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

**No. 11-6879**

---

JOSEPH SEABORN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

OLIVER WASHINGTON, SUPT.; REUBEN FRANKLIN YOUNG,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever, III, Chief District Judge. (5:10-hc-02226-D; 5:10-hc-02227-D; 5:10-hc-02228-D; 5:10-hc-02230-D)

---

Submitted: June 14, 2012

Decided: June 19, 2012

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Sarah Jessica Farber, NORTH CAROLINA PRISONER LEGAL SERVICES, INC., Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellants. Clarence Joe DelForge, III, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Mary Carla Hollis, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, William Baggett, James Powell, LeRoy Richardson, and Joseph Seaborn seek to appeal the district court's order denying relief on their 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petitions. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (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). 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 Baggett, Powell, Richardson, and Seaborn have not made the requisite showings. Accordingly, we deny their motions for certificates of appealability 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