Christopher J. Martin v. Harold W. Clarke Appeal: 15-6702 Doc: 13 Filed: 09/14/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6702

CHRISTOPHER J. MARTIN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (1:14-cv-01425-JCC-IDD)

Submitted: September 9, 2015 Decided: September 14, 2015

Before SHEDD, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher J. Martin, Appellant Pro Se

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 405623858

PER CURIAM:

Christopher J. Martin seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. § 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 Martin 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: 15-6702 Doc: 13 Filed: 09/14/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED