Doc. 404910107

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7821

ROGER LEE HARRELL,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:13-cv-00153-REP)

Submitted: March 27, 2014 Decided: March 31, 2014

Before MOTZ, Circuit Judge, and HAMILTON and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Roger Lee Harrell, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Roger Lee Harrell seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition as The order is not appealable unless a circuit successive. justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. U.S.C. § 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 Harrell 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: 13-7821 Doc: 9 Filed: 03/31/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED