

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-8031

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JOHN K. WILLIAMS,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 06-8032

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JOHN K. WILLIAMS,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 06-8036

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JOHN K. WILLIAMS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, District Judge. (3:02-cr-00548-CMC; 3:03-cr-00838-CMC; 3:05-cv-02669-CMC; 3:05-cv-2670-CMC)

Submitted: May 23, 2007

Decided: June 1, 2007

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

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Alvin Ernest Entin, ENTIN, DELLA FERA & GREENBERG, PA, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, for Appellant. Jane Barrett Taylor, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John K. Williams seeks to appeal the district court's orders and judgment denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion and his motions for reconsideration or to alter/amend. 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 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