

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-7027**

---

TOMMY RILEY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LEROY CARTLEDGE, Warden of McCormick Correctional  
Institution,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

JON OZMINT,

Respondent.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Greenville. J. Michelle Childs, District  
Judge. (6:10-cv-01340-JMC)

---

Submitted: November 2, 2011

Decided: November 16, 2011

---

Before MOTZ, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Tommy Riley, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Deputy  
Assistant Attorney General, William Edgar Salter, III, Assistant  
Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tommy Riley seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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 Riley 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