

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-7331

SCOTT L. ELLISON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ANTHONY PADULA, Warden Lee Correctional Institution,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Aiken. Cameron McGowan Currie, District Judge. (1:09-cv-02261-CMC)

Submitted: March 15, 2011

Decided: March 18, 2011

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

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Scott L. Ellison, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Scott L. Ellison seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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. 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 Ellison 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

* We decline to consider the claims asserted by Ellison in his informal brief that were not presented to the district court. See Muth v. United States, 1 F.3d 246, 250 (4th Cir. 1993).