## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7764

MICHAEL LEE TOWNSEND, SR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD CLARKE,

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-01240-LO-TCB)

Submitted: February 20, 2014 Decided: February 26, 2014

Before DUNCAN, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Lee Townsend, Sr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Micheal Lee Townsend, Sr., seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as successive his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). U.S.C. § Α certificate 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 standard by prisoner satisfies this demonstrating that district court's reasonable jurists would find that the 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 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 Townsend 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 presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED