

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-8162

JOSEPH LEE MCFADDEN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN, RIDGELAND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Respondent.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Terry L. Wooten, Chief District Judge. (5:12-cv-01486-TLW)

Submitted: March 28, 2013

Decided: April 2, 2013

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joseph Lee McFadden, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Joseph Lee McFadden seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on 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 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 McFadden has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny McFadden'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

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

DISMISSED