

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-6484**

---

STANLEY LORENZO WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

DON WOOD, Superintendent; THEODIS BECK,  
Secretary of Corrections,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. Frank W. Bullock, Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:06-cv-00750-JAB)

---

Submitted: August 23, 2007

Decided: August 29, 2007

---

Before WILLIAMS, Chief Judge, and WILKINS and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Stanley Lorenzo Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III, Mary Carla Hollis, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Stanley Lorenzo Williams seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief without prejudice on all claims in his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition and also dismissing as frivolous Claims 1 and 2 with prejudice. 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 Williams has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny the motion for a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny the motion to stay state court proceedings, 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