UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6722

LEROY POPE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LEROY CARTLEDGE, Warden of the McCormick Correctional Institution,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Henry F. Floyd, District Judge. (3:10-cv-01416-HFF)

Submitted: October 18, 2011 Decided: October 28, 2011

Before AGEE and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Leroy Pope, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Melody Jane Brown, Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 11-6722 Document: 5 Date Filed: 10/28/2011 Page: 2 of 3

PER CURIAM:

Leroy Pope 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)(A) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent 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 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 Pope has not made the requisite 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 Appeal: 11-6722 Document: 5 Date Filed: 10/28/2011 Page: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED