Jarrett Holden v. Harold Clarke Appeal: 13-7629 Doc: 10 Filed: 02/20/2014 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7629

JARRETT D. HOLDEN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD CLARKE, Director of VA. D.O.C.,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T.S. Ellis, III, Senior District Judge. (1:13-cv-00897-TSE-TRJ)

Submitted: February 7, 2014 Decided: February 20, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jarrett D. Holden, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 404853367

## PER CURIAM:

Jarrett D. Holden seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge a certificate of appealability. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 Holden has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny 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 Appeal: 13-7629 Doc: 10 Filed: 02/20/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED