

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-6943**

---

CLARENCE LEE ARTIS, III,  
  
Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD CLARKE, Director, Virginia Dept. of Corrections,  
  
Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, Magistrate  
Judge. (3:11-cv-00721-MHL)

---

Submitted: September 19, 2012                      Decided: November 2, 2012

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Clarence Lee Artis, III, Appellant Pro Se. Kathleen Beatty  
Martin, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia,  
for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Clarence Lee Artis, III, 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. 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 Artis has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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