

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-7291**

---

KEITH BRADLEY GRAHAM,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HENRY DARGAN MCMASTER, Attorney General of the State of  
South Carolina; WARDEN LEE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Charleston. Henry F. Floyd, District Judge.  
(2:08-cv-03603-HFF)

---

Submitted: July 28, 2010

Decided: August 10, 2010

---

Before MOTZ, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William Isaac Diggs, DIGGS, DIGGS & AXELROD, Myrtle Beach, South  
Carolina, for Appellant. Melody Jane Brown, Assistant Attorney  
General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Keith Bradley Graham seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). 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). 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 Graham has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED