Filed: 01/25/2013 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7682

ERIC SAMUEL,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LEROY CARTLEDGE,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge. (3:10-cv-01610-TMC)

Submitted: January 22, 2013 Decided: January 25, 2013

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eric Samuel, Appellant Pro Se. James Anthony Mabry, Assistant Attorney General, Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 404278268

PER CURIAM:

Eric Samuel seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Samuel's 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 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 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 Samuel 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: 12-7682 Doc: 7 Filed: 01/25/2013 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED