Khayr Rooks v. Eddie Pearson Appeal: 14-7862 Doc: 13 Filed: 02/19/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 405348070

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7862

KHAYR ROOKS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

EDDIE L. PEARSON, Warden at Sussex I State Prison,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:13-cv-00543-CMH-TRJ)

Submitted: February 12, 2015 Decided: February 19, 2015

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Khayr Rooks, Appellant Pro Se. Craig Stallard, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Khayr Rooks seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. 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 Rooks 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: 14-7862 Doc: 13 Filed: 02/19/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED