

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-8055**

---

LARRY EDWARD HENDRICKS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

COLIE RUSHTON, Warden; HENRY MCMASTER, Attorney General of  
South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Columbia. David C. Norton, District Judge  
(3:03-cv-03201-DCN)

---

Submitted: December 16, 2008

Decided: December 29, 2008

---

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Larry Edward Hendricks, Appellant Pro Se. John William McIntosh,  
Samuel Creighton Waters, Assistant Attorney Generals, Donald  
John Zelenka, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South  
Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Larry Edward Hendricks seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of 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. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 Hendricks 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