

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-7448**

---

AJARON GAMBLE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN, LEE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Henry F. Floyd, District Judge. (3:07-cv-04049-HFF)

---

Submitted: December 9, 2010

Decided: December 30, 2010

---

Before MOTZ, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John Christopher Mills, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant.  
James Anthony Mabry, Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ajaron Gamble 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). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Gamble has not made the requisite showing.\* Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss

---

\* Although Gamble correctly asserts that his petition was timely filed, he does not state a debatable claim of the denial of his Sixth Amendment right to effective counsel.

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