

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-7019**

---

JAMES EDWARD BROWN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

DIRECTOR OF VIRGINIA PRISONS (DOC) ,

Respondent.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District Judge. (1:04-cv-00961-GBL)

---

Submitted: September 26, 2006

Decided: October 3, 2006

---

Before WIDENER and WILKINSON, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James Edward Brown, Appellant Pro Se. Paul Christopher Galanides, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

James Edward Brown seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition. The order is 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 Brown has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Brown's motion for a transcript. While we grant Brown's motion to amend his preliminary brief, we find the issues raised in the brief are frivolous. 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