

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7258**

---

JEFFREY A. PLEASANT,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:14-cv-00783-REP-RCY)

---

Submitted: January 19, 2016

Decided: February 5, 2016

---

Before SHEDD, DUNCAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jeffrey A. Pleasant, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jeffrey A. Pleasant seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on 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 Pleasant has not made the requisite showing. Pleasant is in custody pursuant to a judgment of the Circuit Court for Chesterfield County, Virginia; he is not being detained pending a City of Richmond charge dating back to 2000, contrary to his

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

DISMISSED