

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-6926**

---

FLOYD DINSDALE BOLDING,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; D. M. VAUGHN, Warden of Nottoway  
State Prison; GENE JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia  
Department of Corrections,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. James R. Spencer, Chief  
District Judge. (3:10-cv-00660-JRS)

---

Submitted: November 10, 2011

Decided: December 8, 2011

---

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

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Floyd Dinsdale Bolding, Appellant Pro Se. Joshua Mikell  
Didlake, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Floyd Dinsdale Bolding 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 Bolding 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