

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-7196**

---

LAYTON SHARMALE CUNNINGHAM,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ROY A. COOPER, III, Attorney General of the State of North  
Carolina; JAMES HARDY, Administrator, Nash Correctional  
Institution, Nashville, North Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina, at Durham. James A. Beaty, Jr.,  
Chief District Judge. (1:07-cv-00295-JAB-PTS)

---

Submitted: December 5, 2008

Decided: December 31, 2008

---

Before MICHAEL, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Ann Bach Petersen, James R. Glover, GLOVER & PETERSEN, PA,  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina, for Appellant. Clarence Joe  
DelForge, III, Mary Carla Hollis, Assistant Attorneys General,  
Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Layton Sharmale Cunningham 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 Cunningham has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability 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