

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-6148

RA MAAT PTAH ATUM, a/k/a James H. Jordan,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

JON OZMINT, Director of South Carolina
Department of Corrections; STATE OF SOUTH
CAROLINA; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF
SOUTH CAROLINA,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, District
Judge. (3:05-cv-03361-CMC)

Submitted: May 10, 2007

Decided: May 15, 2007

Before MOTZ and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ra Maat Ptah Atum, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Melody
Jane Brown, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ra Maat Ptah Atum seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing as untimely 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 Atum has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We also deny Atum's motions for discovery, to compel the clerk to reply, to appear before the court, for access to a law library, and to be removed from the custody of the South Carolina Department of Corrections. 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