

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-6459

MICHAEL EDWARD WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

TIM RILEY, Warden; HENRY DARGAN MCMASTER,
Attorney General of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 06-7322

MICHAEL EDWARD WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

TIM RILEY, Warden; HENRY DARGAN MCMASTER,
Attorney General of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District
Judge. (3:05-cv-03082-GRA)

Submitted: November 21, 2006

Decided: November 29, 2006

Before TRAXLER and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Edward Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Melody Jane Brown,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South
Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Michael Edward Williams seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his motion for extension of time to file a response to the state's motion for summary judgment and accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge to deny relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition. 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 Williams 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