

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-7025**

---

JOHN EDWARD COLWELL,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN, BROAD RIVER CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (0:10-cv-01100-HMH)

---

Submitted: November 18, 2010

Decided: December 1, 2010

---

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

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John Edward Colwell, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John Edward Colwell seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for reconsideration of 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. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 Colwell has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny the

pending motion for a new trial, 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