<u>**UNPUBLISHED**</u>

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————

No. 10-6450

———————

HAROLD RAY ESTES,

                    Petitioner - Appellant,

          v.

BUTCH ARONI JACKSON,

                    Respondent - Appellee.

———————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh.   Malcolm J. Howard,
Senior District Judge. (5:08-hc-02153-H)

———————

Submitted: November 18, 2010   Decided: November 29, 2010

———————

Before SHEDD and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

———————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————

Harold Ray Estes, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III,
Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for
Appellee.

———————

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Harold Ray Estes 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 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). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Estes 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