

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-8029**

---

FRANK D. BOATSWAIN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan,  
District Judge. (5:13-hc-02106-FL)

---

Submitted: February 27, 2014

Decided: March 5, 2014

---

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Frank D. Boatswain, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Frank D. Boatswain seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition as an unauthorized successive petition or, in the alternative, denying relief on the 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) (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 Boatswain 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