

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6380

JERRELL REDDIC,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN LEROY CARTLEDGE,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

ATTORNEY GENERAL ALAN WILSON,

Respondent.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Anderson. David C. Norton, District Judge.
(8:12-cv-00232-DCN)

Submitted: August 26, 2014

Decided: September 12, 2014

Before WILKINSON, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeremy A. Thompson, LAW OFFICE OF JEREMY A. THOMPSON, LLC,
Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant. Donald John Zelenka,
Senior Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jerrell Reddic seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (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 Reddic has not made the requisite showing because his petition was not timely filed. 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