

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-6101**

---

NATHANIEL H. JONES, a/k/a Nathaniel Hampton  
Jones, a/k/a Nathaniel Jones, a/k/a Nathaniel  
Hampton,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; HENRY DARGAN  
MCMASTER, Attorney General of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

**No. 05-6114**

---

NATHANIEL H. JONES, a/k/a Nathaniel Hampton  
Jones, a/k/a Nathaniel Jones, a/k/a Nathaniel  
Hampton,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; HENRY DARGAN  
MCMASTER, Attorney General of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

No. 05-6143

---

NATHANIEL H. JONES, a/k/a Nathaniel Hampton  
Jones, a/k/a Nathaniel Jones, a/k/a Nathaniel  
Hampton,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; HENRY DARGAN  
MCMASTER, Attorney General of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Charleston. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District  
Judge. (CA-04-1768-2-13)

---

Submitted: July 27, 2005

Decided: August 16, 2005

---

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Nathaniel H. Jones, Appellant Pro Se. Henry Dargan McMaster,  
Attorney General, William Edgar Salter, III, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Nathaniel H. Jones, a South Carolina prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2254 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, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Jones has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate 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