UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 09-7427

_____

SAMMIE GOODWIN,

               Petitioner - Appellant,

     v.

ELAINE ROBINSON,

               Respondent - Appellee.

_____

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge.
(3:08-cv-02485-RBH)

_____

Submitted: April 20, 2010   Decided: June 1, 2010

_____

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and GREGORY and DUNCAN, Circuit
Judges.

_____

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

_____

Sammie Goodwin, Appellant Pro Se. James Anthony Mabry,
Assistant Attorney General, Donald John Zelenka, Deputy
Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for
Appellee.

_____

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sammie Goodwin seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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. 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 Goodwin has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We grant Goodwin's motion to supplement his informal brief and 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