

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6615

ANIBAL RUBIO SERRANO,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

RENOICE E. STANCIL, Administrator, Bertie Correctional
Institution,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Robert J. Conrad,
Jr., Chief District Judge. (5:10-cv-00047-RJC)

Submitted: November 15, 2011

Decided: November 17, 2011

Before NIEMEYER and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anibal Rubio Serrano, Appellant Pro Se. Mary Carla Hollis,
Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anibal Rubio Serrano 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 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 Serrano has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Serrano's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss this 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