

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-7506

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MICHAEL S. BUFORD, a/k/a Billy,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 09-7552

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MICHAEL S. BUFORD, a/k/a Billy,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior
District Judge. (1:03-cr-00360-CMH-2; 1:09-cv-00169-CMH)

Submitted: January 14, 2010

Decided: February 9, 2010

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael S. Buford, Appellant Pro Se. Jeffrey L. Shih, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Michael S. Buford seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009) motion and his motion for a certificate of appealability. The orders are 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 Buford has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates 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