## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

	No. 08-8033		
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,			
Plaintiff	- Appellee,		
v.			
DERRICK EARL MILLER,			
Defendant	- Appellant.		
	No. 08-8097		
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,			
Plaintiff	- Appellee,		
v.			
DERRICK EARL MILLER,			
Defendant	- Appellant.		
Appeals from the United of South Carolina, at Judge. (6:04-cr-00022-HF	Greenville. H	enry F. Flo	
Submitted: May 28, 2009		Decided:	June 3, 2009

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Derrick Earl Miller, Appellant Pro Se. Elizabeth Jean Howard, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Derrick Earl Miller seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2008) motion.\* The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). 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) (2006). 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 Miller has made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we certificates of appealability and dismiss the appeals. dispense with oral argument because the facts and contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

<sup>\*</sup> Miller filed two notices of appeal from the district court's order, which were docketed as separate appeals in this court.