

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6177

GARY WAYNE PRESLEY, formerly 600249, 214298 Alpha,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; RONALDO MYERS, Director of the
Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Anderson. Richard Mark Gergel, District
Judge. (8:13-cv-00952-RMG)

Submitted: May 22, 2014

Decided: May 29, 2014

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and HAMILTON and DAVIS, Senior
Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gary Wayne Presley, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka,
Senior Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina;
William Henry Davidson, II, David Allan DeMasters, DAVIDSON &
LINDEMANN, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gary Wayne Presley, a state prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (2012) 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 Presley 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