

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6550**

---

JOHN HILL,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia Department of  
Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

**No. 14-6553**

---

JOHN HILL,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia Department of  
Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Arenda L. Wright Allen,  
District Judge. (2:05-cv-00015-AWA-TEM; 2:05-cv-00086-AWA-TEM)

---

Submitted: August 28, 2014

Decided: September 3, 2014

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John Hill, Appellant Pro Se. David Michael Uberman, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John Hill seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his motions to set aside judgments in two 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) proceedings. The orders are 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 and conclude that Hill has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates of appealability and dismiss the appeals. 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.

DISMISSED