

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7835

JEFFREY A. PLEASANT,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director Virginia Dept. of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 14-7847

JEFFREY A. PLEASANT,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA; HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:14-cv-00144-REP-RCY; 3:14-cv-00266-REP-RCY)

Submitted: April 23, 2015

Decided: April 28, 2015

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeffrey A. Pleasant, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jeffrey A. Pleasant seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petitions. 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 records and conclude that Pleasant has not made the requisite showing in either appeal. Accordingly, we deny Pleasant's applications to proceed in forma pauperis, 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