Appeal: 14-6709 Doc: 9 Filed: 09/03/2014 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6709

MARTY WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (2:13-cv-00598-RAJ-DEM)

Submitted: August 28, 2014 Decided: September 3, 2014

Before WILKINSON, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Marty Williams, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 405126919

Appeal: 14-6709 Doc: 9 Filed: 09/03/2014 Pg: 2 of 3

PER CURIAM:

Marty Williams seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition for failure to comply with a court order to pay the filing fee or demonstrate that he could not do so. 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 district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 debatable or wrong. (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 Williams 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 Appeal: 14-6709 Doc: 9 Filed: 09/03/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

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