

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

---

**No. 10-7552**

---

DAVID ROBINSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

VANCE LAUGHLIN; THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Peter J. Messitte, Senior District Judge. (8:10-cv-01800-PJM)

---

Submitted: January 13, 2011Decided: January 21, 2011

---

Before MOTZ, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

David Robinson, Appellant Pro Se. Edward John Kelley, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, for Appellee The Attorney General of the State of Maryland.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David Robinson seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion. These orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 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). 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 Robinson 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