

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6741**

---

DWIGHT SULLIVAN, a/k/a Dwight F. Sullivan, a/k/a Dwight  
Fitzgerald Sullivan,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LEROY CARTLEDGE, Warden of McCormick & Perry Correctional  
Institutions,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Anderson. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge.  
(8:13-cv-00876-TMC)

---

Submitted: September 23, 2014

Decided: October 3, 2014

---

Before NIEMEYER and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Dwight Sullivan, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Dwight Fitzgerald Sullivan seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition, and denying his motion to reconsider. 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 Sullivan has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability 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