

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-6594**

---

MICHAEL LOUIS JOHNSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

COLIE RUSHTON, Warden; HENRY MCMASTER, Attorney General of  
South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Greenville. Solomon Blatt, Jr., Senior District  
Judge. (6:06-cv-02544-SB)

---

Submitted: August 14, 2008

Decided: August 20, 2008

---

Before MICHAEL, Circuit Judge, and WILKINS and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Louis Johnson, Appellant Pro Se. William Edgar Salter,  
III, Assistant Attorney General, Donald John Zelenka, Deputy  
Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Louis Johnson seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). 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) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Johnson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny his motions for appointment of counsel and to compel for the production of documents and things, and we dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED