UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-6213

JAMES RUSSELL ROYAL,

                                        Petitioner - Appellant,

        versus

A. D. ROBINSON,

                                        Respondent - Appellee.

No. 07-6224

JAMES R. ROYAL,

                                        Petitioner - Appellant,

        versus

A. D. ROBINSON,

                                        Respondent - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior
District Judge. (1:06-cv-00416-CMH)

Submitted: August 30, 2007   Decided: September 6, 2007

Before MICHAEL, KING, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————————

Jeroyd Wiley Greene, III, ROBINSON & GREENE, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellant. Eugene Paul Murphy, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

———————————

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James Russell Royal seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition. 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 record and conclude that Royal 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