

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6143**

---

CHAD LAMONT WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DAVID MITCHELL,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

**No. 17-6228**

---

CHAD LAMONT WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DAVID MITCHELL,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina,  
at Raleigh. James C. Dever III, Chief District Judge. (5:15-hc-02105-D)

---

Submitted: May 12, 2017

Decided: May 18, 2017

---

Before SHEDD and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Chad Lamont Williams, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DeForge, III, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Chad Lamont Williams seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 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 Williams has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Williams' requests for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny his motion to appoint counsel, 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*