

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6926**

---

CHARLES WATSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

BRAD PERRITT,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:13-hc-02221-BO)

---

Submitted: October 24, 2014

Decided: November 5, 2014

---

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Charles Watson, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles Watson seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition and denying his motion for reconsideration. 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); Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 369 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 Watson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Watson's motion for a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny his motion for

consideration as moot, 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