Donnie Morton v. Frank Perry Appeal: 15-7754 Doc: 15 Filed: 05/27/2016 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 405999158

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7754

DONNIE GEORGE MORTON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

FRANK L. PERRY,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Catherine C. Eagles, District Judge. (1:15-cv-00319-CCE-LPA)

Submitted: May 24, 2016 Decided: May 27, 2016

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Donnie George Morton, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III, Nicholaos George Vlahos, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Donnie George Morton seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge 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 Morton has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Morton's motion for 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

Appeal: 15-7754 Doc: 15 Filed: 05/27/2016 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED