

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6612

DANTE MARCELLOUS BROADWAY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, District Judge. (1:13-cv-00065-LO-TCB)

Submitted: September 13, 2013

Decided: October 2, 2013

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dante Marcellous Broadway, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dante Marcellous Broadway seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition for failure to either pay the filing fee or return an in forma pauperis application. 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 Broadway has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Broadway'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