

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-7450

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

NATHANIEL A. RICHARDSON, JR., a/k/a Nathaniel
Skeeter, a/k/a Skeet,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 04-6394

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

NATHANIEL A. RICHARDSON, JR., a/k/a Nathaniel
Skeeter, a/k/a Skeet,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District
Judge. (CR-96-153; CA-02-942-2)

Submitted: May 26, 2004

Decided: June 17, 2004

Before WIDENER, MOTZ, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nathaniel A. Richardson, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Laura P. Tayman,
Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Nathaniel A. Richardson, Jr., a federal prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000), and denying his motion to alter or amend the judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). The orders are 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 his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Richardson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny certificates of appealability and dismiss the appeals. 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