

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-7369**

---

RICHARD EDWARD CABEY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

BONNIE BOYETTE, Superintendent,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:03-hc-00816-BO)

---

Submitted: January 17, 2008

Decided: January 25, 2008

---

Before TRAXLER, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed in part; dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Richard Edward Cabey, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Richard Edward Cabey seeks to appeal the district court's order 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. See 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. See 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 Cabey has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. With respect to Cabey's double jeopardy claim, for which the district court previously granted a certificate of appealability, we affirm the denial of relief. 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.

AFFIRMED IN PART;  
DISMISSED IN PART