

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-7715**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

BARRINGTON ISAACS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. David C. Norton, District Judge. (CR-98-356, CA-01-2230-2-18)

---

Submitted: June 19, 2003

Decided: June 24, 2003

---

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Barrington Isaacs, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Hayden Bickerton, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Barrington Isaacs, a federal prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000), denying his motion for reconsideration, and denying his motion for relief. An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find both that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 123 S. Ct. 1029, 1040 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Isaacs has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Isaacs's motion for judicial notice. 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