

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-6052

MORRIS J. WARREN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

MARK BOLSTER, Acting Warden; J. RAY ORMOND, New Warden; UNITED
STATES PAROLE COMMISSION,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 19-6226

MORRIS J. WARREN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

MARK BOLSTER, Acting Warden; J. RAY ORMOND, New Warden; UNITED
STATES PAROLE COMMISSION,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:18-cv-00601-LMB-MSN)

Submitted: May 16, 2019

Decided: May 20, 2019

Before DIAZ and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Morris J. Warren, Appellant Pro Se. Catherine M. Yang, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Morris J. Warren, a District of Columbia Code Offender incarcerated at FCI Petersburg, seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on Warren's 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2012) petition and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion for relief from judgment. 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 Warren has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Warren's motion for a certificate of appealability in Appeal No. 19-6052, deny a certificate of appealability in Appeal No. 19-6226, and dismiss these 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