Holden v. Lee Doc. 920080728

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-6678

RUSSELL HOLDEN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

ROBEY C. LEE, Warden of Central Prison, Raleigh, North Carolina,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:00-hc-00850-F)

<del>------</del>

Submitted: January 18, 2008 Decided: July 28, 2008

Before KING, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kevin Patrick Bradley, Durham, North Carolina, for Appellant. Jill Ledford Cheek, Special Deputy Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Russell Holden, Jr., 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). certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." § 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); <u>Slack v. McDaniel</u>, 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 Holden has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We further deny Holden's request for the appointment of counsel. 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