

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-8023

KEITH LEMONT SANDERS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia
Department of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 06-8050

KEITH LEMONT SANDERS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia
Department of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District
Judge. (2:03-cv-00598-RAJ; 2:03-cv-411)

Submitted: April 25, 2007

Decided: May 18, 2007

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Keith Lemont Sanders, Appellant Pro Se. Margaret Winslow Reed,
Steven Andrew Witmer, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA,
Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Keith Lemont Sanders seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motions for reconsideration of the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petitions. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 Sanders has not made the requisite showing in either case. Accordingly, although we grant Sanders's motion to amend his informal brief, we deny certificates of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis in each case, 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