UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6609

DENNIS PATTON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ALVIN W. KELLER, Secretary, N.C. Department of Correction; VANESA GILBERT, Captain, Henderson County Jail,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Martin K. Reidinger, District Judge. (1:09-cv-00280-MR)

Submitted: September 29, 2011 Decided: October 5, 2011

Before KING, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dennis Patton, Appellant Pro Se. Mary Carla Hollis, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dennis Patton 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)(A) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of а 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 When the district court denies relief on procedural (2003).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 Patton 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

2

Appeal: 11-6609 Document: 6 Date Filed: 10/05/2011 Page: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED