

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-6746**

---

METAPHYZIC EL-ECTROMAGNETIC SUPREME-EL, f/k/a Antonio Edward McLean,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:14-cv-00052-REP-RCY)

---

Submitted: July 21, 2015

Decided: July 24, 2015

---

Before WILKINSON and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Metaphyzic El-electromagnetic Supreme-El, Appellant Pro Se. Alice Theresa Armstrong, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Metaphyzic El-Ectromagnetic Supreme-El seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition and denying his motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). 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 Supreme-El has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny the motion for 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED