

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-6793**

---

DAVID DWIGHT RAMAN, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

FRANK PERRY,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Loretta Copeland Biggs, District Judge. (1:14-cv-00248-LCB-JEP)

---

Submitted: September 3, 2015

Decided: October 13, 2015

---

Before KING, FLOYD, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

David Dwight Raman, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David Dwight Raman, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to deny relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. 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 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 Raman has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Raman's motion for transcript at government expense, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny 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