

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-7921**

---

TARIF ABDULLAH,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

MICHAEL STOUFFER, Warden; STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. William M. Nickerson, Senior District  
Judge. (CA-05-1050-WMN-1)

---

Submitted: March 23, 2006

Decided: March 30, 2006

---

Before WILKINSON, LUTTIG, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Tarif Abdullah, Appellant Pro Se. Michael O'Connor Doyle,  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, Baltimore,  
Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Tarif Abdullah, a Maryland inmate, seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition, which the district court construed as a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2000) petition, and denying reconsideration. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 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 both that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. 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 Abdullah has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Abdullah's motions for appointment of counsel and for oral argument, 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