UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6075

ISAAC J. WALKER,

Petitioner – Appellant,

v.

WARDEN LEROY CARTLEDGE,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge. (4:14-cv-03749-RBH)

Submitted: May 18, 2016 Decided: May 23, 2016

Before SHEDD, DIAZ, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Isaac J. Walker, Appellant Pro Se. Melody Jane Brown, Assistant Attorney General, Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Isaac J. Walker seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on 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 Walker has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Walker's motions for appointment of counsel and to expand a certificate of appealability. 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