

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6350

DERRICK BENARD WOODS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN OF BROAD RIVER CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

JOHN OZMINT, Director of SC Dept. of Corrections,

Respondent.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Beaufort. David C. Norton, District Judge.
(9:10-cv-02726-DCN)

Submitted: July 19, 2012

Decided: July 23, 2012

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Derrick Benard Woods, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka,
Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Derrick Benard Woods 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 "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 Woods has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We further deny Woods' motion for transcript at government expense. 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