

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6694

EDWARD MACK, a/k/a Edward D. Mack,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LARRY CARTLEDGE, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge.
(5:13-cv-01021-MGL)

Submitted: July 23, 2015

Decided: July 28, 2015

Before NIEMEYER and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Edward Mack, Appellant Pro Se. William Edgar Salter, III,
Assistant Attorney General, Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant
Attorney General, Brendan McDonald, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Edward Mack seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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). 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 Mack has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Mack's motion for a certificate of appealability 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