

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6030

EARNEST EDWARD VAUGHN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN OF TURBEVILLE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Jacquelyn Denise Austin, District Judge. (6:23-cv-04220-JDA)

Submitted: June 18, 2026

Decided: June 23, 2026

Before GREGORY and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Earnest Edward Vaughn, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Earnest Edward Vaughn seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge, denying relief on Vaughn's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition, and denying his motion for reconsideration. He also moves to obtain court records if a certificate of appealability is granted. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A). 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 could find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. *See Buck v. Davis*, 580 U.S. 100, 115-17 (2017). 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. *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Vaughn has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny his motion to obtain court records, 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED