Doc. 404251224

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7203

MANSOUR SALAHMAND,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

PEGGY ANTHONY; PROBATION & PAROLE DISTRICT 25; DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (1:12-cv-00493-JCC-TCB)

Submitted: November 28, 2012 Decided: January 8, 2013

Before WILKINSON, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mansour Salahmand, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mansour Salahmand seeks to appeal the district court's order 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. § 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 Salahmand has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Salahmand's motion for 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

Appeal: 12-7203 Doc: 13 Filed: 01/08/2013 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED