

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6573

ANTHONY JUNIOR BARNHILL,
Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Respondent - Appellee.

No. 14-6575

ANTHONY JUNIOR BARNHILL,
Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Respondent - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:12-hc-02130-F; 5:12-hc-02153-F)

Submitted: September 25, 2014 Decided: September 29, 2014

Before WILKINSON and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Junior Barnhill, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Anthony Junior Barnhill seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying identical post-judgment motions he filed in the underlying 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) proceedings. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 Barnhill has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss the appeals. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED