

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-6497

JAMES ARTHUR VINES,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN GEORGE SNYDER, Warden; EDWARD REILLY, Chairman U.S.
Parole Commission,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan,
Chief District Judge. (5:09-hc-02070-FL)

Submitted: February 4, 2011

Decided: March 9, 2011

Before NIEMEYER and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James Arthur Vines, Appellant Pro Se. Matthew Fesak, Jennifer
P. May-Parker, Assistant United States Attorneys, Michael Gordon
James, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North
Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James Arthur Vines, a District of Columbia Code offender, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2241 (West 2006 & Supp. 2010) 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 Vines 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 contentions are adequately presented in the materials

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED