

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 08-8508

---

JOHN DAVID MCBRIDE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE JOHNSON,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

No. 09-6278

---

JOHN DAVID MCBRIDE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE JOHNSON,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, Magistrate Judge. (3:08-cv-00246-MHL)

---

Submitted: May 28, 2009

Decided: June 4, 2009

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John David McBride, Appellant Pro Se. Susan Mozley Harris,  
Assistant Attorney General, Alice T. Armstrong, OFFICE OF THE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, John David McBride seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition and denying relief on his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and 60(b) motions. These orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006); 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) (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. 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 McBride has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeals. 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