

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-7727**

---

DAVID F. EATON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director, VDOC,

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-00834-MHL)

---

Submitted: January 22, 2013

Decided: January 25, 2013

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

David F. Eaton, Appellant Pro Se. Robert H. Anderson, III, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David F. Eaton seeks to appeal the magistrate judge'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. 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 relief is denied 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 relief is denied 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 Eaton has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We

---

\* The parties consented to the jurisdiction of the magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2006).

dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED