

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-7822**

---

BERNARD BAGLEY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

CECILIA REYNOLDS, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE, AND PARDON  
SERVICES,

Respondent.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Terry L. Wooten, Chief District  
Judge. (5:11-cv-02664-TLW)

---

Submitted: February 21, 2013

Decided: February 25, 2013

---

Before AGEE and DAVIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Bernard Bagley, Appellant Pro Se. Tommy Evans, Jr., SOUTH  
CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION, PAROLE & PARDON SERVICES,  
Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Bernard Bagley, a state prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2241 (West 2006 & Supp. 2012) 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 Bagley 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

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

DISMISSED