

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-6688**

---

KEITH RENARD HARRIS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

DIRECTOR OF VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

**No. 06-6689**

---

KEITH RENARD HARRIS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

DIRECTOR, VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

**No. 06-6692**

---

KEITH RENARD HARRIS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

DIRECTOR OF VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:05-cv-00095-CMH; 1:05-cv-00404-CMH; 1:05-cv-00204-CMH)

---

Submitted: September 29, 2006                      Decided: November 15, 2006

---

Before MICHAEL, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Keith Renard Harris, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Francis McDonnell, Attorney General, Michael Thomas Judge, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Keith Renard Harris seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petitions. The orders are 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 records and conclude that Harris has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates of appealability and dismiss the appeals. We also deny Harris' motion to expand request for certificate of appealability. 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