

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-6069

JOHN ROOSEVELT BACCUS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN OF EVANS CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort.
David C. Norton, District Judge. (9:24-cv-04290-DCN)

Submitted: August 21, 2025

Decided: August 26, 2025

Before WILKINSON, HARRIS, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Roosevelt Baccus, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John Roosevelt Baccus seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition as an unauthorized, successive § 2254 petition. The order is 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, as here, 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 Baccus has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Baccus's motions: to file an amicus brief, compel production of a videotape, for production of a transcript at the Government's expense, for judicial notice of his motions, and to appoint counsel; to enforce his civil rights; and raising restrictive covenants and public outcry concerns. 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