

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-6754**

---

JOHN ROOSEVELT BACCUS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

STAN BURTT, Warden; HENRY DARGAN MCMASTER,  
Attorney General,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Rock Hill. David C. Norton, District Judge.  
(0:06-cv-01912-DCN)

---

Submitted: September 11, 2007      Decided: September 17, 2007

---

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John Roosevelt Baccus, Appellant Pro Se. Derrick K. McFarland,  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South  
Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John Roosevelt Baccus seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition. The order is not appealable 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 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 that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Baccus has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny his motion for appointment of counsel, 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