

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6674

TURUK SAUNDERS, a/k/a Turick Frazier,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN OF BROAD RIVER PRISON,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 17-7227

TURUK SAUNDERS, a/k/a Turick Frazier,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN OF BROAD RIVER PRISON,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Charleston. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (2:16-cv-01724-RMG)

Submitted: November 21, 2017

Decided: December 6, 2017

Before MOTZ, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Turuk Saunders, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Deputy Attorney General, Susannah Rawl Cole, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Turuk Saunders seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on 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 Saunders has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate 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