UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6598

CORNELIUS ALVIN NOBLES,

                    Petitioner - Appellant,

          v.

WILLIE DAVIS,

                    Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh.   Terrence W. Boyle,
District Judge. (5:09-hc-02122-BO)

Submitted: August 25, 2011   Decided: August 30, 2011

Before MOTZ, DUNCAN, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Cornelius Alvin Nobles, Appellant Pro Se.   Clarence Joe
DelForge, III, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North
Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Cornelius Alvin Nobles seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition as untimely. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (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 Nobles 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