

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6265

TIMOTHY DARRELL DAVIS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL MCCALL, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (4:11-cv-03263-MGL)

Submitted: June 19, 2014

Decided: June 23, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Timothy Darrell Davis, Appellant Pro Se. William Edgar Salter, III, Assistant Attorney General, Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Timothy Darrell Davis seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendations of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The orders are 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 Davis has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Davis' motion for 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