UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————

No. 06-7660

———————

CHARLES MILLIGAN,

                                        Petitioner - Appellant,

        versus

STAN BURTT, Warden, Lieber Correctional
Institution; HENRY MCMASTER, Attorney General
of South Carolina,

                                        Respondents - Appellees.

———————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Rock Hill. David C. Norton, District Judge.
(0:05-cv-01999-DCN)

———————

Submitted: January 25, 2007   Decided: January 30, 2007

———————

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

———————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————

Charles Milligan, Appellant Pro Se. Melody Jane Brown, OFFICE OF
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South Carolina,
for Appellee.

———————

PER CURIAM:

Charles Milligan seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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 that Milligan has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we 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