

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-6952

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ALLEN JETT, a/k/a Al,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 06-6953

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

ANTOINE DEPAUL MARSHALL, a/k/a Chim Chim,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William M. Nickerson, Senior District Judge. (1:96-cr-00458-WMN; 1:04-cv-03791-WMN; 1:04-cv-03792-WMN)

Submitted: March 29, 2007

Decided: April 3, 2007

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas Turner Ruffin, Jr., Washington, D.C., for Appellants. Jamie M. Bennett, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Allen Jett and Antoine Marshall seek to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on their 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motions, and their motions for reconsideration filed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). 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 neither Jett nor Marshall has made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates of appealability and dismiss the appeals. We further deny the pending motions for the appointment of counsel. 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