UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 09-7226

_____

WARREN N. CEPHAS,

              Petitioner - Appellant,

     v.

GENE JOHNSON, Director, VA Dept. of Corrections,

              Respondent - Appellee.

_____

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, Magistrate
Judge. (3:08-cv-00731-MHL)

_____

Submitted: February 11, 2010   Decided: February 19, 2010

_____

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

_____

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

_____

Warren N. Cephas, Appellant Pro Se. Gregory William Franklin,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia,
for Appellee.

_____

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Warren N. Cephas 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 Cephas 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

---

[*] Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2006), the parties consented to proceed before a magistrate judge.

2

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED