

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-6178**

---

BENNY DERRELL KING,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

BOBBY P. SHEARIN, N.B.C.I. Warden; DOUGLAS F. GANSLER, The  
Attorney General of the State of Maryland; ATTORNEY GENERAL  
OF MARYLAND,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District  
Judge. (8:09-cv-02014-AW)

---

Submitted: March 2, 2011

Decided: March 21, 2011

---

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Benny Derrell King, Appellant Pro Se. Edward John Kelley,  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland,  
for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Benny Derrell King 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) (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 King has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny 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