Case: 10-6689 Document: 12 Date Filed: 10/21/2010 Page: 1

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-6689

DARRYL PONCE KINNARD,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LORETTA KELLY,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, District Judge. (1:09-cv-01116-LO-TCB)

Submitted: October 14, 2010 Decided: October 21, 2010

Before MOTZ, KING, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Darryl Ponce Kinnard, Appellant Pro Se. Benjamin Hyman Katz, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Case: 10-6689 Document: 12 Date Filed: 10/21/2010 Page: 2

PER CURIAM:

Darryl Ponce Kinnard 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 Kinnard 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

Case: 10-6689 Document: 12 Date Filed: 10/21/2010 Page: 3

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED