

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 06-6027

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

IVANDER JAMES, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

No. 06-6582

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

IVANDER JAMES, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. C. Weston Houck, Senior District Judge. (4:01-cr-00965-CWH; 4:05-cv-00096-CWH)

---

Submitted: August 9, 2006

Decided: August 31, 2006

---

Before NIEMEYER, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Ivander James, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Alfred William Walker  
Bethea, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Florence, South  
Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Ivander James, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion, 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 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 James has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeals. 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