Eric Tywon Tankard v. Frank B. Bishop, Jr. Appeal: 15-6995 Doc: 8 Filed: 10/23/2015 Pg: 1 of 2

Doc. 405679632

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6995

ERIC TYWON TANKARD,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN FRANK B. BISHOP, JR.; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. James K. Bredar, District Judge. (1:14-cv-03831-JKB)

Submitted: October 16, 2015 Decided: October 23, 2015

Before NIEMEYER and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eric Tywon Tankard, Appellant Pro Se. Edward John Kelley, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eric Tywon Tankard seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely 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 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 Tankard 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 adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED