

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-7061**

---

STANLEY LORENZO WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

SIDNEY HARKLEROAD, Superintendent; THEODIS BECK, Secretary  
of Corrections,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder,  
District Judge. (1:03-cv-00299-TDS-WWD)

---

Submitted: December 21, 2011

Decided: December 30, 2011

---

Before KING, GREGORY, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Stanley Lorenzo Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Sandra Wallace-  
Smith, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Stanley Lorenzo Williams seeks to appeal the district court's order affirming and adopting the order of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Williams' post-judgment motion in his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) action. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (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 Williams 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