

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-6667**

---

CHRISTOPHER G. DARBY, a/k/a Chris Darby,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN CARTLEDGE,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Charleston. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge.  
(2:12-cv-00021-TLW)

---

Submitted: August 22, 2012

Decided: August 27, 2012

---

Before WILKINSON, GREGORY, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Christopher G. Darby, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher G. Darby seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge to dismiss his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition as an unauthorized, successive 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 Darby has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We further deny Darby's motions for the appointment of counsel and for transcripts 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