Filed: 03/02/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7503

DANIEL PETERSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

KEITH WHITENER,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever, III, Chief District Judge. (5:14-hc-02023-D)

Submitted: February 25, 2015 Decided: March 2, 2015

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Daniel Peterson, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 405362369

## PER CURIAM:

Daniel Peterson seeks to appeal the district court's order finding that his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition is successive and dismissing it without prejudice on that basis. 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 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 Peterson 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: 14-7503 Doc: 9 Filed: 03/02/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED