UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

───────────────

No. 15-7715

───────────────

EGBERT FRANCIS, JR.,

              Petitioner - Appellant,

     v.

ADMINISTRATOR DAVID MITCHELL,

              Respondent - Appellee.

───────────────

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle,
District Judge. (5:15-hc-02007-BO)

───────────────

Submitted: February 25, 2016   Decided: March 2, 2016

───────────────

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

───────────────

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

───────────────

Egbert Francis, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

───────────────

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Egbert Francis, Jr., 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. 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 Francis 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 presented

2

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

<u>DISMISSED</u>