UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

·		
-	No. 17-6945	
THOMAS L. HICKS,		
Petitioner - Ap	ppellant,	
v.		
VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF C	ORRECTIONS, Dire	ector,
Respondent - A	Appellee.	
-		
Appeal from the United States D Roanoke. Glen E. Conrad, District		
Submitted: November 16, 2017		Decided: November 21, 2017
Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a	and TRAXLER and I	KEENAN, Circuit Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curis	am opinion.	
Thomas L. Hicks, Appellant Pr ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRO		
Unpublished oninions are not hindi	ing precedent in this	circuit

PER CURIAM:

Thomas L. Hicks seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) 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) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 Hicks 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED