UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 09-6269

_____

WANDA SCOTT, a/k/a Wanda Renae Scott Thomas,

                    Petitioner - Appellant,

        v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

                    Respondent - Appellee.

_____

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Greenville. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., Senior
District Judge. (6:08-cv-01684-GRA)

_____

Submitted: August 20, 2009   Decided: August 26, 2009

_____

Before WILKINSON and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON,
Senior Circuit Judge.

_____

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

_____

Wanda Scott, Appellant Pro Se. James Anthony Mabry, Assistant
Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

_____

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Wanda Scott seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on her 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 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. 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 Scott has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Scott's motions to appoint counsel and to consolidate. 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