

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-8025

CARGYLE BROWN SOLOMON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

SHAREESE KESS-LEWIS; RANDOLPH T. LEWIS,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 13-8028

In re: CARGYLE BROWN SOLOMON,

Petitioner.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District
of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Paul W. Grimm, District Judge.
(8:13-cv-02436-PWG; 8:13-mc-00584; 8:13-cv-03793-PWG)

Submitted: March 25, 2014

Decided: March 28, 2014

Before GREGORY, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

No. 13-8025, Dismissed; No. 13-8028, Affirmed by unpublished per
curiam opinion.

Cargyle Brown Solomon, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Cargyle Brown Solomon seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on her 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition (No. 13-8025) and the order imposing on her a prefiling injunction (No. 13-8028). We dismiss Solomon's appeal from the denial of her § 2254 petition and affirm the issuance of the prefiling injunction.

The order dismissing Solomon's § 2254 petition is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 on appeal in No. 13-8025 and conclude that Solomon has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Solomon's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal.

Further, in No. 13-8028, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing a prefiling injunction. Cromer v. Kraft Foods N. Am., Inc., 390 F.3d 812, 817 (4th Cir. 2004) (stating standard of review). Accordingly, we affirm. We deny Solomon's pending motions seeking a writ of habeas corpus and an emergency hearing. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

No. 13-8025, DISMISSED;
No. 13-8028, AFFIRMED