

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6103**

---

GREGORY WARDELL DRIVER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director, Virginia Department of  
Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

BILL WATSON; PORTSMOUTH CIRCUIT COURT,

Respondents.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District  
Judge. (2:14-cv-00590-RAJ-LRL)

---

Submitted: May 18, 2016

Decided: May 23, 2016

---

Before SHEDD, DIAZ, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Gregory Wardell Driver, Appellant Pro Se. Kathleen Beatty  
Martin, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia,  
for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gregory Wardell Driver 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 Driver has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny

a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal as moot.\*  
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

---

\* We note that Driver's supervised probation ended in November 2015.