

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6406

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

AARON EUGENE WOODS,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 12-6835

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

AARON EUGENE WOODS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Glen E. Conrad, Chief District Judge. (7:09-cr-00043-GEC-RSB-1; 7:11-cv-80326-GEC-RSB; 7:09-cr-00064-GEC-RSB-1; 7:11-cv-80325-GEC-RSP)

Submitted: August 22, 2012

Decided: August 24, 2012

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Aaron Eugene Woods, Appellant Pro Se. Jennie L. M. Waering,
Assistant United States Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Aaron Eugene Woods seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) motions from two separate criminal convictions. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (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 motion 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 Woods has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeals. We deny Woods' motion for transcripts at government expense. 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