UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-6522

MICHAEL LERCH,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GEORGE M. HINKLE, Warden, Greensville Correctional Center,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, Magistrate Judge. (3:08-cv-00305-MHL)

Submitted: September 3, 2009 Decided: November 18, 2009

Before MICHAEL and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Lerch, Appellant Pro Se. Josephine Frances Whalen, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Lerch seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition.* The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See § 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).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 Lerch has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. dispense with oral argument because the facts and

 $^{^{\}ast}$ The parties consented to the jurisdiction of the magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2006).

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED