Brian Hart v. VDOC Appeal: 13-7982 Doc: 6 Filed: 04/21/2014 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-7982

BRIAN KEITH HART,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. John A. Gibney, Jr., District Judge. (3:13-cv-00160-JAG)

Submitted: April 17, 2014 Decided: April 21, 2014

Before WILKINSON, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Brian Keith Hart, Appellant Pro Se. Susan Mozley Harris, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 404939607

## PER CURIAM:

Brian Keith Hart 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. See 28 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 Hart has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal Appeal: 13-7982 Doc: 6 Filed: 04/21/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED