UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6805

WALTER DOUGLAS WHITFIELD,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD CLARKE, Director of Department of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:11-cv-00511-LMB-IDD)

Submitted: September 13, 2011 Decided: October 12, 2011

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Walter Douglas Whitfield, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 11-6805 Document: 12 Date Filed: 10/12/2011 Page: 2 of 3

PER CURIAM:

Walter Douglas Whitfield seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his successive 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2006); Jones v. Braxton, 392 F.3d 683, 687 (4th Cir. 2004). 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. We have independently reviewed the record and 484-85. conclude that Whitfield 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 Appeal: 11-6805 Document: 12 Date Filed: 10/12/2011 Page: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED