UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6225

GEORGE STANLEY BRANHAM, II,

Petitioner – Appellant,

v.

JOEL ANDERSON, Acting Director, South Carolina Department of Corrections; SHANE JACKSON, Warden Lee Correctional Institution,

Respondents – Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Sherri A. Lydon, District Judge. (0:23-cv-00745-SAL)

Submitted: June 1, 2026 Decided: August 19, 2026

Before GREGORY and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: E. Charles Grose, Jr., THE GROSE LAW FIRM, Greenwood, South Carolina, for Appellant.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Petitioner George Branham seeks a Certificate of Appealability ("COA") on his petition for writ of habeas corpus, alleging ten grounds of ineffective assistance of counsel.

Petitioner was accused of sexually assaulting his former partner's seven-year-old daughter. After a jury trial, he was convicted and sentenced to fifty years in prison by a South Carolina state court. Since then, Petitioner has filed an appeal of his conviction and sentence and an application for post-conviction relief ("PCR"), both of which were denied.

On February 24, 2023, Petitioner filed a federal habeas petition, asserting ten claims of ineffective assistance of trial counsel—the same ten claims presented in his PCR application. The magistrate judge and the district court judge dismissed his original habeas petition, but granted Petition the opportunity to amend his petition and submit supplemental briefing to cure the deficiency. Petitioner did that. Nonetheless, the magistrate judge and the district court judge both agreed that his second round of briefing remained insufficient. Accordingly, the district court denied his petition and denied his request for a certificate of appealability.

This Court has reviewed Petitioner's brief and the case record. For the reasons stated in the district court's order, the magistrate judge's Report & Recommendation, and the PCR court's decision on the same issues, we find that Petitioner has failed to demonstrate a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, as required for the issuance of a COA. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

PETITION DENIED