

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-7024

MURRAY LEON SMITH,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

BUREAU OF PRISONS; HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director; DAVID A. ROBINSON, Regional Director; KENNETH T. CUCCINELLI, II, Attorney General; GEORGE M. HINKLE, Respondent Custodian Chief Warden; DAVID H. BECK, Spotsylvania County Judge; ROBERT B. VAN ARSOALE, Appointed, Office of the U.S. Trustee; WILLIAM F. NEELY, Chief Prosecuting Attorney; KIMBERLY A. HACKBARTH, Assistant Commonwealth Attorney; CHRISTALYN M. JETT, Deputy Clerk of the Circuit Court,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:11-cv-00070-REP)

Submitted: March 15, 2012

Decided: March 19, 2012

Before DUNCAN and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Murray Leon Smith, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Murray Leon Smith seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely 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)(A) (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) (2006). 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 Smith has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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