Filed: 06/29/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6161

JOHN EDWARD KUPLEN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

FRANK PERRY,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. William L. Osteen, Jr., Chief District Judge. (1:14-cv-00078-WO-LPA)

Submitted: June 25, 2015 Decided: June 29, 2015

Before GREGORY, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Edward Kuplen, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 405520245

Appeal: 15-6161 Doc: 9 Filed: 06/29/2015 Pg: 2 of 3

PER CURIAM:

John Edward Kuplen seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Kuplen's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition relating to a prison disciplinary conviction and denying his motion to alter or The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or amend. judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not absent "a substantial showing of the denial 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 Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 is debatable or wrong. (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 Kuplen 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

Appeal: 15-6161 Doc: 9 Filed: 06/29/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED