

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7805**

---

CLARENCE ROBINSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LEVERN COHEN,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Orangeburg. David C. Norton, District Judge.  
(5:14-cv-02071-DCN)

---

Submitted: March 25, 2016

Decided: April 7, 2016

---

Before AGEE and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Clarence Robinson, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Clarence Robinson seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition for failure to exhaust state court remedies. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 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 Robinson 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