

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-7263**

---

STANLEY LORENZO WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

SIDNEY HARKLEROAD, Superintendent; THEODIS  
BECK, Secretary of Corrections,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina, at Durham. Frank W. Bullock, Jr.,  
District Judge. (CA-03-299-1)

---

Submitted: December 22, 2005

Decided: January 3, 2006

---

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Stanley Lorenzo Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Sandra Wallace-Smith,  
Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Stanley Lorenzo Williams seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60 motion seeking reconsideration of the district court's order adopting and affirming the magistrate judge's denial of several post-judgment motions in Williams' 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) action. 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 the district court's assessment of his constitutional claims is 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 Williams has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Williams' motion to proceed in forma pauperis, 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