

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-7598

EDUARD LORENZ,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

CHARLES E. DAVIS, III,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

CHAIRMAN, VIRGINIA PAROLE BOARD,

Respondent.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (1:07-cv-00940-JCC-TCB)

Submitted: November 3, 2008

Decided: November 17, 2008

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eduard Lorenz, Appellant Pro Se. Richard Carson Vorhis, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eduard Lorenz 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 Lorenz has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Lorenz's motion for injunctive 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.

DISMISSED