## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-6136

CLAYTON BENJAMIN, JR., a/k/a Clayton Benjamin,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ANTHONY J. PADULA, Warden, Lee Correctional Institution,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Anderson. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge. (8:07-cv-04019-TLW)

Submitted: July 30, 2009 Decided: August 4, 2009

Before MOTZ, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Clayton Benjamin, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. James Anthony Mabry, Assistant Attorney General, Donald John Zelenka, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Clayton Benjamin, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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) (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). Α prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); <u>Slac</u>k v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Benjamin 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 also deny Benjamin's motion to appoint counsel and 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.