

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-7285**

---

GINA MONTEZ BENJAMIN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia Department of  
Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Douglas E. Miller, Magistrate  
Judge. (2:10-cv-00043-DEM)

---

Submitted: February 10, 2011

Decided: February 18, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON and DAVIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Gina Montez Benjamin, Appellant Pro Se. Eugene Paul Murphy,  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia,  
for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gina Montez Benjamin seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's order dismissing as untimely her 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 Benjamin 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

---

\* The parties consented to the exercise of the district court's jurisdiction by a magistrate judge, as permitted by 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2006).

and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED