

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-8434**

---

PAUL WALLACE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND; ROBERT  
KOPPEL,

Respondents - Appellees,

and

JOHN A. ROWLEY,

Respondent,

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge.  
(1:07-cv-03406-CCB)

---

Submitted: July 29, 2009

Decided: August 11, 2009

---

Before GREGORY, DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Paul Wallace, Appellant Pro Se. Edward John Kelley, OFFICE OF  
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Paul Wallace seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) 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) (2006). 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) (2006). 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 Wallace 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