

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7079

JOHNNY BURNSIDE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

ROBERT M. STEVENSON, Warden - BRCI,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (9:11-cv-03354-JFA)

Submitted: November 21, 2013

Decided: November 25, 2013

Before KING, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Johnny Burnside, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Melody Jane Brown, Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Johnny Burnside seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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 Burnside has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. Burnside's motion for appointment of counsel is denied. 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