

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-7050**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM IVON TURNER, a/k/a William Ivon Bush,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 07-7222**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM IVON TURNER, a/k/a William Ivon Bush,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James P. Jones, Chief District  
Judge. (1:03-cr-00012-jpj; 7:06-cv-00198-jpj)

---

Submitted: February 29, 2008

Decided: March 7, 2008

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William Ivon Turner, Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer Rebecca Bockhorst,  
OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Abingdon, Virginia, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, William Ivon Turner seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion and denying his motions for reconsideration. 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 that Turner 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