Malcolm Muhammad v. Harold Clarke Appeal: 12-6370 Doc: 12

Filed: 08/03/2012 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6370

MALCOLM MUHAMMAD

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director, VA Department of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, District Judge. (1:11-cv-00345-LO-IDD)

Submitted: July 30, 2012 Decided: August 3, 2012

Before WILKINSON, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Malcolm Muhammad, Appellant Pro Se. Gregory William Franklin, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 404018272

PER CURIAM:

Malcolm Humammad seeks to appeal the district court's order 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. See § 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 When the district court denies relief on procedural (2003).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 Muhammad 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 Appeal: 12-6370 Doc: 12 Filed: 08/03/2012 Pg: 3 of 3

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED