

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-7776**

---

ROYAL DIAMOND DOWNS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND; PERRY PHELPS, Warden; ATTORNEY GENERAL  
OF MARYLAND,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge.  
(1:12-cv-01085-CCB)

---

Submitted: February 28, 2013

Decided: March 22, 2013

---

Before KEENAN, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Royal Diamond Downs, Appellant Pro Se. Edward John Kelley,  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland,  
for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Royal Diamond Downs seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition and denying his motion to alter or amend the judgment. These orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 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 Downs 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED