

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6787**

---

CURTIS EUGENE WILDS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

REUBEN YOUNG, Secretary, North Carolina Department of  
Public Safety,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. L. Patrick Auld,  
Magistrate Judge. (1:12-cv-01106-LPA)

---

Submitted: July 25, 2013

Decided: July 30, 2013

---

Before GREGORY, DAVIS, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Curtis Eugene Wilds, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge,  
III, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Mary Carla Hollis,  
Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Curtis Eugene Wilds seeks to appeal the district court'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 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 Wilds has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny leave to appear in person, 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