

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-7379

BARRY ALBERT,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T. S. Ellis, III, Senior District Judge. (1:06-cv-01436)

Submitted: March 18, 2008

Decided: April 8, 2008

Before MICHAEL, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Barry Albert, Appellant Pro se. Richard Carson Vorhis, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Barry Albert seeks to appeal the district court's order 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. See 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. See 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 Albert has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we 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

*To the extent Albert appeals the portion of the district court's order denying potential relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000), we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error in the reasoning of the district court. See Albert v. Dir., Dep't of Corr., No. 1:06-cv-01436 (E.D. Va. Aug. 1, 2007).