Allan Rother v. Harold Clarke Appeal: 15-7978 Doc: 10 Filed: 05/19/2016 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7978

ALLAN L. ROTHER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District Judge. (1:15-cv-00967-GBL-TCB)

Submitted: May 13, 2016 Decided: May 19, 2016

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

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Allan L. Rother, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 405981885

PER CURIAM:

Allan L. Rother seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on 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 Rother 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

Appeal: 15-7978 Doc: 10 Filed: 05/19/2016 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED