

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-6358**

---

ANDRE FIDEL HOPKINS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

S. K. YOUNG, Warden; COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA; GENE JOHNSON,  
Director, Department of Corrections,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Anthony J. Trenga,  
District Judge. (1:09-cv-00901-AJT-JFA)

---

Submitted: June 17, 2010

Decided: June 28, 2010

---

Before MOTZ and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Andre Fidel Hopkins, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Andre Fidel Hopkins seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition as untimely filed. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 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 Hopkins has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We further deny Hopkins' motions for leave to file all district court documents and to order the record. 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