UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 07-7662

_____

LARKLAND RICHARDS,

                    Petitioner - Appellant,

          v.

HENRY MCMASTER; JON OZMINT, Director of the South Carolina
Department of Corrections; WARDEN, Trenton Correctional
Institution,

                    Respondents - Appellees.

_____

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Charleston. Margaret B. Seymour, District
Judge. (2:06-cv-03343-MBS)

_____

Submitted: June 19, 2008   Decided: June 23, 2008

_____

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

_____

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

_____

Larkland Richards, Appellant Pro Se. Melony Jane Brown, Assistant
Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

_____

PER CURIAM:

Larkland Richards 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). 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 Richards has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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