

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-6459**

---

DAVID JAMES CUDWORTH,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia Department of  
Corrections; CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER OF DISTRICT 15,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Jackson L. Kiser, Senior  
District Judge. (7:09-cv-00373-jlk-mfu)

---

Submitted: December 16, 2010

Decided: December 27, 2010

---

Before GREGORY, DUNCAN, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

David Bernard Hargett, HARGETT LAW, PLC, Glen Allen, Virginia,  
for Appellant. Craig Stallard, Assistant Attorney General,  
Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David James Cudworth seeks to appeal the district court's order 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. 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 Cudworth 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