UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7449

MICHAEL WAYNE CEPHAS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

COMMONWEALTH,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:14-cv-01066-CMH-IDD)

Submitted: December 18, 2014 Decided: December 23, 2014

Before SHEDD, WYNN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Wayne Cephas, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 405280496

PER CURIAM:

Michael Wayne Cephas seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition without prejudice for failure to exhaust state court remedies. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 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 Cephas 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 argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately Appeal: 14-7449 Doc: 9 Filed: 12/23/2014 Pg: 3 of 3

presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED