

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-6851**

---

THOMAS LEE BELCHER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE M. JOHNSON, Director, Virginia Department of  
Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior  
District Judge. (3:10-cv-00823-REP)

---

Submitted: November 3, 2011

Decided: November 30, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Robert Allen Ratliff, ROBERT A. RATLIFF, PC, Mobile, Alabama;  
Jennifer T. Stanton, J.T. STANTON, PC, Norfolk, Virginia, for  
Appellant. Virginia Bidwell Theisen, Senior Assistant Attorney  
General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Thomas Lee Belcher seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely 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 "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 Belcher 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