

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-7394

GARY STEVEN SCOTT, former #273698,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ANTHONY PADULA, Warden of Lee Correctional Institution,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

JON OZMINT,

Respondent.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Greenville. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.,
District Judge. (6:10-cv-02190-JFA)

Submitted: March 29, 2012

Decided: April 2, 2012

Before WILKINSON, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gary Steven Scott, Appellant Pro Se. Brendan McDonald, OFFICE OF
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Donald John Zelenka,
Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gary Steven Scott seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting 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)(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 Scott has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Scott's motion for 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